R4250-1.1F

20 Years of Quality Programming

Research Notes

February 1990 Number 33

National Programming for Multicultural Audiences -- Aiming for Effectiveness and Efficiency

By Richard H. Madden

Each of the radio program series funded by CPB is plainly aimed at meeting some aspect of public radio's mission. Several are aimed at meeting public radio's toughest goals -- innovation and diversity.

But are they also serving multicultural audiences effectively and efficiently? Serving these audiences is an essential element of CPB's and the system's missions. And, if these programs serve them both effectively and efficiently, what does that imply for other funders and producers of programming?

These questions arise from the conclusion that how public radio tries to serve these audiences is just as important as how the programming itself relates to either the broader objectives of public radio's mission or the multicultural character of the production team. That conclusion was probably the most important outcome of the comprehensive study that was summarized in the paper "Myth and the Minority Audience: Black and Hispanic Use of Public and Commercial Radio," which CPB published in *Research Notes* in February 1989.

Programming Economics

To answer whether CPB-funded programs are effective and efficient in serving multicultural audiences, CPB decided to use a method of analysis known as "programming economics," which was developed primarily by Audience Research Analysis. This kind of analysis is discussed more fully in the pamphlet *Programming Economics*, which CPB published in June 1989, but it is worth a brief digression here. Two key calculations are applied in programming economics:

Richard H. Madden is director of CPB's Radio Program Fund and of its System Development Fund.

- The first focuses on effectiveness, looking at the audience use of a program or series, as measured in listener-hours.

- The second determines efficiency, coupling the listener use data with total production cost data for programs or series.

The effectiveness, or listener-hour, measure combines the number of persons served and the length of time they are served. This transcends notions of cume, AQH, and time-spent-listening by combining them into a single measure of gross consumption. One person listening to a program for five hours results in five listener-hours; five persons listening for one hour apiece also yield five listener-hours.

The principle behind the efficiency analysis is illustrated by asking which of the following is preferable:

- a program that costs $160,000 and enjoys 75,000 listener-hours? or

- a program that costs $40,000 and enjoys 75,000 listener-hours?

Both programs have the same effectiveness (i.e., the same number of listener-hours), but the second is at one-quarter the cost. Which is the more efficient program? Assuming the same intrinsic merit and mission, the answer is clearly the latter.

Determining the program's efficiency, i.e., the cost of serving one listener for one hour (or CPL, cost per listener-hour), permits a comparison across program, format, and station types. Under this model, differences in production cost or in airtime required between one program and another are counterbalanced by differences in audience expectations; the CPL formula scales all programs or series against a common yardstick -- the cost of serving one listener for one hour.

This comparison can be enhanced by establishing benchmarks to which all programs can be compared. One such benchmark would be a CPL averaged over all programming broadcast systemwide. Such a calculation, for FY 1989 for example, should include:

- all stations -- say, the 312 Community Service Grantees;

- all programming -- more than 2 million hours of national and local programming;

- all listening to that programming -- more than 100 million listener-hours a week (i.e., the effectiveness of the programming), and

- all costs -- the estimated $300 million FY 1989 costs of providing this programming systemwide.

In Spring 1989, the cost of serving one public radio listener for one hour -- the systemwide CPL -- happened to average out at a little more than a nickel, about $.058.

No series will be as efficient in its early years as established programming (say, *All Things Considered* and *Morning Edition*) is now. Those two programs, in isolation, currently cost about $.014 to serve one listener for one hour. On the other hand, even in their early lives, national programs should be more efficient in providing their unique public service than the average program of all types carried by stations, i.e., they should cost less than $.058. For continuing series in particular, such efficiencies should be demonstrable whether or not the production costs are defrayed by CPB or other funders, which could include stations.

The eight CPB-funded continuing series listed in Table 1 have total annual production costs of nearly $6 million. (A description of each series is provided at the end of this paper.) CPB provides about 40 percent of the total. Accordingly, relationships between cost and audience, i.e., the effectiveness and efficiency of programming, must be considered given the scarce production funds available to producers from stations, CPB, and other sources.

Using the programming economics methods described above, CPLs were calculated for these eight series for the Winter through Summer quarters of 1989. Audience data were provided by Arbitron through the Radio Research Consortium.

In these calculations, four programs (*Fresh Air, Marketplace, Crossroads,* and *Afropop*) were more efficient than the average program (national or local) in serving their audiences, i.e., their CPL was less than the system average of $.058.[1] Remember: the $.058 CPL system average is not the average of just these eight programs but of all programs, national and local, systemwide.

---

[1] The system CPL of $.058 includes all local costs, e.g., transmitter utility costs. The costs for each series include only production costs.

Accordingly, all eight of these CPB-funded series could have been above system average, or all could have been below average.

A ranking of these eight, from most efficient to least efficient, is also provided. The break point between those series more efficient than the average national or local program and those less efficient is between *Crossroads* and *Soundprint*, i.e., between fourth and fifth. The average series above the break point was almost six times more efficient in serving audiences than those below.

Table 1. Production cost per listener-hour and rank for all listeners, Winter - Summer quarters 1989

	Cost per listener-hour (CPL)	Rank by CPL for all listeners
Fresh Air	**$0.020**	**1**
Marketplace	**0.028**	**2**
Afropop	**0.050**	**3**
Crossroads	**0.051**	**4**
Soundprint	**0.072**	**5**
Good Evening	**0.102**	**6**
Latin File	**0.297**	**7**
New American Radio	**0.386**	**8**

How to read this table: During the first three calendar quarters of 1989, the production cost for *Fresh Air* of serving one listener for one hour averaged $.02. The same cost for *New American Radio* was $.386. Stated differently, *Fresh Air* was 19 times more efficient in providing its public service than *New American Radio.*

Source: CPB Radio Program Fund

Not only were these four series more efficient, they were also more effective. *Fresh Air, Marketplace, Crossroads,* and *Afropop* were more than five times more effective in serving audiences, enjoying nearly 575,000 listener-hours on

average, while the remaining series enjoyed only 104,000 listener-hours on average.

Multicultural Audiences

Moving back to the core of this discussion, which of these series are more effective and more efficient in serving their audiences? Program economics offers some answers.

Because Arbitron identifies Hispanic listeners as a distinct ethnic group in markets with high concentrations of Hispanics, listening to these series by Hispanics can be estimated.[2] Thus, Hispanic audience data can be folded into the programming economics formula with total production cost data to calculate an indexed Hispanic CPL.

These kinds of indexed Hispanic CPLs and rank-orders were calculated for the same eight CPB-funded series as above, as shown in Table 2. Interpretation of

Table 2. Production cost per listener-hour and rank for Hispanic listeners, Winter - Summer quarters 1989

	Cost per listener-hour	Rank by CPL for all listeners	Rank by index for Hispanic listeners
Fresh Air	**$0.020**	**1**	**1**
Marketplace	**0.028**	**2**	**3**
Afropop	**0.050**	**3**	**4**
Crossroads	**0.051**	**4**	**2**
Soundprint	**0.072**	**5**	**8**
Good Evening	**0.102**	**6**	**7**
Latin File	**0.297**	**7**	**5**
New American Radio	**0.386**	**8**	**6**

Source: CPB Radio Program Fund

[2] Indeed, under Arbitron's current practices, about 60 percent of Hispanic listeners age 12 and above nationwide are *identified as Hispanic* in the reporting of their radio listening data. The remainder are represented in Arbitron's samples, but are not identified as to race or ethnicity.

the indexed CPLs for any subset of the audience is complicated. Comparisons to the CPLs for all listeners would be incorrect, because the production costs cannot be allocated among the ethnic groups into which the listeners are segmented. Comparisons from program to program of these indexed CPLs are fully legitimate, however, so to streamline the presentation, only the rankings are provided in the remainder of this paper.

As with the systemwide CPL benchmark for all listeners, a systemwide benchmark for Hispanic listeners was also determined. In this ranking, *Fresh Air*, *Crossroads*, and *Marketplace* on average were almost six times more efficient in serving Hispanic audiences than the other studied series. They were also eight times more effective in reaching Hispanics, enjoying 10,000 Hispanic-listener-hours on average, compared to 1,250 Hispanic-listener-hours on average for the remaining series.

Arbitron also identifies Black listeners as a distinct racial group in markets with high concentrations of African-Americans. Thus, listening to these series by Black persons can also be estimated.[3] Thus, audience data for Black listeners,

Table 3. Production cost per listener-hour and ranks for all listeners, and for Hispanic, Black, and all other listeners, Winter - Summer quarters 1989

	Cost per listener-hour (CPL)	Rank by CPL for all listeners	Rank - index for Hispanic listeners	Rank - index for Black listeners	Rank - index for all other listeners
Fresh Air	$0.020	1	1	2	1
Marketplace	0.028	2	3	5	2
Afropop	0.050	3	4	1	4
Crossroads	0.051	4	2	3	3
Soundprint	0.072	5	8	4	5
Good Evening	0.102	6	7	6	6
Latin File	0.297	7	5	7	7
New American Radio	0.386	8	6	8	8

Source: CPB Radio Program Fund

[3] Under Arbitron's current practices, about 66 percent of Black listeners age 12 and above nationwide are *identified as Black* in the reporting of their radio listening data. The remainder are represented in the samples, but are not identified as to race or ethnicity.

too, can be folded into the programming economics formula with total production cost data to calculate an indexed Black CPL. Table 3 extends the data in Table 2 to reflect the rankings of the eight series for Black audiences.

As with the total audience and with Hispanic listeners, a systemwide benchmark was calculated for the average of all national or local programs. By these calculations, five programs are more efficient than the average national or local program in serving Black audiences. In order, they are: *Afropop, Fresh Air, Crossroads, Soundprint,* and *Marketplace.* Indeed, these series were nearly 13 times more efficient on average in serving listeners than the other studied series. They were also more than 10 times more effective in reaching Black listeners, enjoying 28,000 Black listener-hours on average, compared to 2,700 Black listener-hours for the other studied series.

The final column of Table 3 includes rank-orders for "all other" listeners.[4] Three series were more efficient than the average national or local program. In order they were: *Fresh Air, Marketplace,* and *Crossroads.* Indeed, they were almost six times more efficient than the other studied series. They were also seven times more effective in reaching listeners, enjoying 680,000 listener-hours on average, compared to 9,500 listener-hours for the other studied series.

Looking Beyond the Numbers, What Does This All Mean?

Moving beyond the numbers, are any CPB programs consistently more effective and efficient in serving multicultural audiences? *Crossroads, Fresh Air,* and *Marketplace* consistently perform above the systemwide averages in effectively and efficiently serving identifiable, discrete segments of the audience, i.e., Hispanics, Blacks and "all others." For this analysis, the audience was segmented along a racial and ethnic dimension, so these programs can be considered to be particularly effective and efficient in serving multicultural audiences.

To assist in developing other new programs that evidence the same qualities, what characteristics do *Crossroads, Fresh Air,* and *Marketplace* have in common? While this is highly subjective, it is possible to sketch some programmatic, carriage, and format traits based on this and other research:

---

[4] They include both Hispanic and Black persons who are not identified by ethnicity or race, other minority listeners (Arbitron does not identify members of other minorities), and the remainder of public radio's audiences.

Programmatic:

- Each is good radio, as recognized by the number of people served.
- Each maintains the consistent core appeal of public radio, i.e., the series are stimulating, intelligent, unique, valuable and entertaining.

Carriage:

- The quality and appeal of each is such that they enjoy carriage on a significant number of stations in communities with significant numbers of Blacks and Hispanics in the population and, most likely, in the stations' overall audiences.
- The quality and appeal of each is such that they enjoy better placement in station schedules.
- The frequency of each is such that they enjoy consistent placement in station schedules.

Format:

- Each is designed to fit within the context of a larger, consistent station format making the programming more accessible to all listeners and, as a result, apt to be heard by more Black and Hispanic listeners. Black and Hispanics, and by implication, other ethnic groups, tune in to these series and their reasons for doing so are largely for the same reasons that non-ethnic audiences tune in. They tune in to formats.

While these are common factors, distinctions remain. One is independently produced; the others are produced by stations. One costs about $350,000 per year to produce; each of the others costs more than $1 million. Two are daily programs; the other is weekly. In one case, the production team is multicultural. And so forth.

Clearly, audiences of differing cultures have chosen to enfranchise *Crossroads*, *Fresh Air*, and *Marketplace* via their listening. The producers of these series must respond in kind, by serving these varied audiences with the appropriate content and perspective. As with all audiences, however, the franchise is a temporary one. Indeed, while the factors that suggest these series are more effective and efficient in serving a multicultural audience can be identified, the series are not static offerings. Audiences will shift as frequently as producers adjust their production team, program content, budgets, and production approach,

and as stations adjust their local schedules. And, the appeal can change as new, different -- perhaps better, more effective and more efficient -- programs emerge in the public radio marketplace.

And, it is the vitality of the current public radio marketplace that offers opportunities and challenges for any producer. For example, *Afropop*, with an audience that is one third Black, is becoming *Afropop Worldwide*. Will it be able to retain its effectiveness and efficiency in serving Black listeners while broadening its appeal?

Other, broader questions suggested by this discussion are:

- Stating that some series are not as effective or as efficient as others does not mean that other system benefits (e.g. training) are not derived from such efforts. How should the acknowledged benefit of serving audiences be considered in light of these other system benefits?

- Stating that certain series are more effective in serving Blacks or Hispanics is not the same as stating that they have large Hispanic or Black audiences. It does, however, provide clues to the programs that may appeal to these audiences. What steps should public broadcasting be taking to increase these audiences?

- And, given what is known about public radio's audience, the series estimated to be more effective and efficient in serving multicultural audiences are likely serving the most educated members of the respective racial and ethnic groups. Is it possible to broaden public radio's appeal to include less educated audiences of all types?

Again, the key assumption in answering these and other questions will be the primary importance of public radio's missions, which include serving multicultural audiences. This paper demonstrates that certain CPB-funded series are more effective and efficient than others in serving such audiences. Indeed, several CPB-funded series are estimated to be more efficient than the average national or local program in serving multicultural audiences. These results reinforce the notion that the way public radio tries to serve multicultural audiences is just as important as the broader, mission-related objectives of the programming itself or the multicultural character of the production team.

Programs Discussed In This Paper

Title: *Afropop*
Producer: Sean Barlow, World Music Productions, Brooklyn, NY
Description: Weekly one-hour programs
Synopsis: A showcase of recordings from top African pop musicians.

Title: *Crossroads*
Producer: Elizabeth Perez-Luna, Earmark, Inc., Miami, FL
Description: Weekly half-hour and modules
Synopsis: A multicultural public affairs and arts magazine.

Title: *Fresh Air With Terry Gross*
Producer: Terry Gross, WHYY Radio, Philadelphia, PA
Description: 360 daily one-hour programs
Synopsis: An arts, culture and entertainment service featuring interviews with leading writers, actors, composers, musicians and filmmakers; as well as reviews of films, records and books; and previews of television shows.

Title: *Good Evening*
Producer: Tom Voegeli, Minnesota Public Radio, St. Paul, MN
Description: Weekly 90-minute programs
Synopsis: A variety program broadcast featuring several major acts along with a regular cast of supporting characters.

Title: *Latin File*
Producer: Benjamin Davis, National Public Radio, Washington, DC
Description: 260 15-minute Programs
Synopsis: A daily news service that addresses Hispanic issues in the U.S.A.

Title: *Marketplace*
Producer: Jim Russell, KUSC FM, Los Angeles, CA
Description: Daily half-hour programs and daily modules
Synopsis: A series to help listeners hear the world through a business/economic perspective and to relate the impact of the complex world of international commerce on their lives.

Title: *New American Radio*
Producer: Helen Thorington, New Radio and the Performing Arts, Inc., Brooklyn, NY
Description: Weekly half-hour programs
Synopsis: A radio arts series featuring commissioned works from producers encouraged to push the limits and conventions of radio genres; to develop new approaches to their materials; and to explore the limits of technology.

Title: *Soundprint*
Producer: Bill Siemering, WJHU Radio, Baltimore, MD
Description: Weekly half-hour programs
Synopsis: A series that investigates issues which need to be brought to the attention of the American people, profiles individuals who have had a significant impact in shaping thought in their discipline, and tells stories in a literary form reflecting the American experience and promoting cross-cultural understanding.

20 Years of Quality Programming

Research Notes

February 1990 Number 34

How The Public Looks At The Aims Of Public Television

By Salvina Cappello

> *If you see a shark coming you can shoot it, but a bunch of ducks can sneak up on you and peck you to death and you can't do anything about it.*
>
> Scott Sassa, Turner Network Television

Fragmentation and competition in television is causing pressure among all broadcasters, commercial and noncommercial alike. Audience erosion among network affiliates and some other television broadcasters was the topic of the '80s, but it remains unresolved at the onset of the '90s. Additionally, political turmoil abroad and changes in immigration policy at home have altered the composition of the American population. Therefore, the public whom public broadcasters seek to serve is also changed.

What must public broadcasters do to serve this public effectively?

Do the goals outlined by the first Carnegie Commission more than 20 years ago have the same relevance to how public broadcasting serves the public today?

We decided to take these issues to the people whom public broadcasters want to reach -- the American public. CPB commissioned the Roper Organization to survey a national sample of adults who were questioned in person about some of the original goals and objectives of public broadcasting. The question was twofold: first, how important do respondents believe it is for public television to meet each of eight goals described in the Carnegie Commission report *Public Television: A Program for Action*, and second, how would they grade public television's performance in meeting each goal?

Salvina Cappello is responsible for audience and program research undertaken by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Most Americans consider the original goals and objectives of public television to be important. Of particular importance are objectives relating to children's programming and news and public affairs. People believe that educating children, especially preschoolers, is the most important goal of public television (91 percent consider it "very important" or "important") and also where public television performs best (performance grade = A-).

Almost equally important as an objective for public television in the minds of Americans is effectively increasing the understanding of news events and public affairs. People graded public television's performance on that score at a B+, which could imply room for improvement.

Conversely, two objectives that seem noticeably less important in the public's view concern innovation in the performing arts and what might be called the "golden oldies," which the Carnegie Commission described as "preserving the best that television has to offer" series. These categories received importance ratings of 69 percent and 67 percent respectively. Public television received a B grade for performance on both counts.

DO the results differ between those who view public television and those who do not? Interestingly, the objectives score very similarly in rank order for both importance and performance, but the actual importance ratings and performance grades that viewers give are higher than those from non-viewers. Among non-viewers, public television received especially low grades in providing a platform for diverse social groups, in showing the current and latest things in the performing arts and preserving and bringing back to the screen the best programs from television's past. Fortunately, non-viewers consider these objectives to be considerably less important, as well.

African-Americans attach only marginally greater importance to public television's role in "providing a platform for diverse social groups, such as ethnic minorities, to express themselves, both artistically and politically" than does the general public. Furthermore, African-Americans gave public television the same performance grade for delivering this to the American population as did the general public (B). It is possible that the African-Americans who were surveyed simply do not think that this objective should be the primary focus of the public television agenda.

Like the general public, African-Americans see the informal education of children, especially pre-schoolers, as the most important role of public television (88% importance rating). Similarly, the second most important role for public television that African-Americans identified is increasing public awareness and understanding of news events and public affairs (87%). The performance grades, B+ and B respectively, though, show that mostAfrican-Americans think there is room for improvement in these areas.

Interestingly, downscale respondents (in terms of income and education) were overall tougher graders of public television performance.

Regardless of household income, the education of young children and the need to increase the people's understanding of news events and public affairs remained the two most important objectives. People in households with income of less than $15,000 a year, consider increasing people's understanding of news events and public affairs to be the most critical objective (90% importance rating); with the education of children a close second (86%). These people graded public television at a B+ in both areas.

In households with an income of more than $35,000, educating children and fostering increased understanding of news events and public affairs were equally rated at 94%. These households graded public television's performance in educating children an A -- one of the highest grades received from any group for performance on any objective. The gave public television a B+ for performance in increasing knowledge of news events and public affairs.

Among college educated respondents, educating children and increasing people's understanding of news events and public affairs were rated equally important (93% importance rating). High school graduates with no college background also rate these two objectives the most important, but at a 90 percent rating. Non-high school graduates rated children's education as the most important (86%) and increasing the people's understanding of news events and public affairs second (83%).

Politically and socially active people, too, give their highest importance ratings for helping informally to educate children (94%), and for increasing people's understanding of news events and public affairs (94%), but they also attach considerable importance to an objective considered somewhat less important by other groups -- increasing Americans' knowledge of other nations and of the great variety of cultures within our own nation (92%). Although these respondents were fairly complimentary, with the grade for children's education by public broadcasters (A), the grades that they gave public television for its performance in increasing public awareness of news events and public affairs (B+) and for increasing Americans' knowledge of other nations and cultures (B) reflects their view that there is considerable room for improvement in these areas.

(These findings are derived from a Roper Organization survey in October 1989 in which a nationwide cross-section of 1,974 men and women 18 years of age and older were interviewed in person. A multistage, stratified probability sample was used.)

Table 1. Public Expectations For Public Television

(Among the general public)

Objectives	Importance Rating	Performance Grade
1. To help educate children informally, especially pre-schoolers	91	A-
2. To increase people's understanding of news and public affairs	90	B+
3. To increase American's knowledge of other nations and the great variety of cultures within our nation	86	B
4. To provide analysis and interpretation of important issues and ideas	80	B
5. To make the best of the performing arts -- such as symphony orchestras, theaters, and ballet companies -- more accessible to people	73	B
6. To offer a platform for diverse social groups, such as ethnic minorities, to express themselves, both artistically and politically	72	B
7. To show the current and latest things in the performing arts	69	B
8. To preserve and bring back to the screen the best programs from television's past	67	B

Source: Roper Report 89-10

Table 2. Public Television's Role In Providing a Platform For Diverse Programming

	Importance Rating	Performance Grade
General Public	72	B
Public Television Viewers	78	B
Public Television Non-Viewers	63	C
African-Americans*	75	B

*Sample Size = 218

R4250-1.3F 10/90

20 Years of Quality Programming

Research Notes

February 1990 Number 35

Public Television Community Outreach in Six Markets

By Research Communications, Ltd.

This report presents results from a half-year-long effort to obtain information about community outreach efforts by PBS television stations in six markets: Los Angeles; Detroit; Dallas; Lexington, Kentucky (for the state of Kentucky); Albuquerque; and Springfield, Massachusetts.

The mission of public television stations includes service to the communities in which they operate. Many public television stations recently have discovered that providing service to the community not only through programming, but through more proactive efforts in promoting programming, in linking resources within the community via broadcast, and in direct involvement in the community aids in garnering public support and viewership for the station -- important precursors to gaining financial support from the community.

Public television stations are not alone in recognizing the advantages of community outreach. Local commercial television stations also have come to recognize the importance of supporting public service efforts through on-air and community-based campaigns which address social issues such as AIDS, drugs, volunteerism, and illiteracy. In fact, ABC has joined PBS in expanding community awareness about the problem of illiteracy in the U.S. and the Public Television Outreach Alliance (PTOA) has been instrumental in organizing the Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS) effort.

Despite the fact that so much activity exists, little has been done to document public television stations' community outreach efforts or to identify the outcomes achieved. Each year the PTOA has sponsored research to document station activities related to the projects they have sponsored. Also, a few case studies on task force development for the PLUS projects have been completed for the PTOA. However, most other information has been anecdotal based on informal sharing among outreach coordinators at the stations and regional PTOA coordinators.

Research Communications, Ltd., of Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, was commissioned by CPB to undertake this study. Dr. Valerie Crane is the firm's principal; Susan Young was project director.

The purpose of this study was to document outreach in six sites and to identify the impact of outreach in local communities. It was found that stations have difficulty conducting outreach given limited resources; therefore, few assessments of outcomes of projects have been made on any systematic basis. The type of information which exists about project outcomes is typically anecdotal and reflects very different experiences at each station. Nevertheless, we feel that the information contained in the report provides an excellent base for beginning to understand outreach as it exists at these stations and to identify the types of outreach that have proven successful according to the perceptions of station staff and a sample of community leaders and home viewers.

Summary of Findings

The case studies in this report represent six very distinctive outreach models -- three in large markets, one in a state network, and two in medium-sized markets (one of which is borderline small). While each of them has participated to some extent in the national Public Television Outreach Alliance (PTOA) efforts and each has described anecdotally a role that the national projects have played in stimulating interest and action at the stations in community outreach, they all have undertaken independent local outreach projects in their communities. It is for these independent local efforts that they were identified as prospective "models" for the case studies at the outset. Each is described briefly below.

KCET/Los Angeles - Outreach at KCET consists of a project topics and techniques which are conducted continuously throughout the year and on a special project basis with a full-time outreach staff of three. Outside funding for outreach activities from corporations and foundations has reached about $750,000 in the last three years and producers are seeking the support of the outreach staff as projects are initiated. The Community Advisory Board actively participates in the station's outreach planning and implementation.

KERA/Dallas-Fort Worth - While KERA participated in the PTOA projects prior to this year, their principal outreach project is the past year's effort at easing racial tensions in the metropolitan area, called Project Crossroads. This year-long project consumed the bulk of the station's resources and represented one of the most massive multi-media cooperative efforts in the country. It involved local program production and widespread coordination of religious organizations throughout the area.

WTVS/Detroit - Two projects were identified as the basis for WTVS' selection as one of the case studies: Project Graduation, a five-year long project to combat substance abuse among southeastern Michigan's youth, and *Club Connect*, a new program produced at WTVS by and for young people which will serve as the crux of

the station's community development efforts in the future. These efforts will continue to be devoted to issues related to the area's youth. WTVS is the only station of those in this study which has combined "community development" and program production in one department where staff work hand-in-hand on projects.

KET/Kentucky - KET has joined with the governor's wife in a statewide campaign to publicize the state's resources in adult basic education and through KET's *GED On TV* program to enable more of Kentucky's citizens to complete the GED high school equivalency examination. KET's *GED On TV* program has been broadcast for five years, but the efforts to promote the program have resulted in a recent increase in awareness of the state's low educational level and in the number of adults completing the GED examination. Almost all of the home viewers and community leaders in the surveys for this project were aware of the program - a rather astounding awareness level.

KNME/Albuquerque - KNME is operating with a different model for outreach from any of the above. The station has only had an outreach coordinator for two years. His role is more one of a community organizer and activist than of direct provision of outreach services to the community. He is involved extensively on the boards of other organizations in the community and is providing an important role in national outreach efforts by translating PSAs into Spanish and serving as an Hispanic sounding board.

WGBY/ Springfield, MA - As with other smaller stations, WGBY in Springfield, Massachusetts, has operated under resource constraints which have limited the amount of community outreach that could be undertaken. However, in the last year they have combined forces with the local cable television foundation to support a series of documentaries and town meetings focusing on topics identified as critical to the community. This effort is gaining recognition in the community and is expected to be the focus of the station's production and outreach efforts for the future.

Major findings from this study are summarized and discussed here and are followed with recommendations based on these findings. Detailed findings are included in individual case studies in the full report.

Station Outreach Environment

There is no one successful model for outreach efforts. What works seems to vary by station and community resources and needs. Lacking a national model for outreach, these six PBS stations have structured community outreach to

meet their own needs, which may vary over time. For example, while ABC/PBS efforts to establish literacy councils and coalitions were described as successful in most sites, in Springfield, the station was able to recruit more volunteer tutors than the local agencies could train and organize. Therefore, despite the station's success in doing its job, the lack of an effective local infrastructure was a barrier to success of the effort. In other markets, turf problems with other agencies have been cited as impeding success of one project or another. Although the local PBS station can serve as an effective neutral stimulus for organizing and coordinating other community agencies, doing this requires staff time, effort, and management support. Due to the varying situation in each community, all six stations expressed the need to undertake outreach projects which fit their local situations.

The large market stations and the state network have staff who are dedicated to outreach. The smaller stations have assigned outreach as part of the responsibility of staff members. Not surprisingly, it seems that more can be accomplished by staff whose responsibilities are more focused on outreach. For example, if Springfield had a person who could have helped more in coalition-building, perhaps the literacy efforts could have been more successful. It also appears from the six sites in this study that outreach staff with community agency or organization experience are more successful in forging relationships with community agencies, while staff with backgrounds in promotion are most effective in waging campaigns to promote the outreach projects in the media.

However, staffing is not all that is required. Cooperative efforts between the community outreach department and program producers are critical to the effective development of outreach with a broadcast link. Support of outreach by the general manager and the board is critical to its success whether there is a direct broadcast link or not. All six of the sites emphasized the importance of the support of management and the producer/outreach cooperation. In fact, at WTVS in Detroit, community development and program development are in the same department, under one vice-president.

Use of Community Advisory Boards

A supportive body for outreach is the Community Advisory Board, which currently is used at only one of the six sites (KCET in Los Angeles). KCET's advisory board found that the role of commenting on the quality and suitability of programming posthoc was an unsatisfying role. Therefore, they designed for themselves a role in community outreach and were instrumental in hiring the current director of outreach at that station. She has subsequently worked to de-

velop the board as an integral part of the outreach feedback loop. In other words, advisory board members who represent many community organizations, serve as KCET's "eyes and ears" to the community. They provide ideas about outreach projects, are involved in outreach planning and implementation, and serve as links to the community who can garner other resources from among their colleagues as needed. They also can keep their "ears to the ground" about attitudes towards KCET's programming and outreach from among its diverse target audiences.

Influence of Public Television Outreach Alliance

Another source of support for community outreach departments in stations has been the Public Television Outreach Alliance (PTOA). Although there is no evidence because of turnover among staff, several outreach staff said they thought that the success of the first *Chemical People* project in organizing community resources and establishing relationships served as the initial stimulus for outreach efforts at the stations. The Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS) projects also were useful to the station in establishing relationships with the ABC local affiliate and with businesses in the community through the business breakfasts. Although only two stations reported on the fall 1989 mentoring program, both related considerable success. However, some stations cited turf problems with and/or among local literacy groups, which impeded success with the effort.

The suggestions for activities and the telephone support offered by the regional PTOA coordinators were described as helpful. Collegial interchange is desirable among outreach staff at different stations. However, some resistance exists toward the PTOA when stations feel they are being strongly encouraged to participate in projects that they do not have the time or resources to conduct effectively. Both large and smaller stations in this group have participated on a broadcast-only basis in at least one of the PTOA projects because of conflicts with local efforts such as outreach or the station auction.

Outreach Funding

Stations' sources of financial support for community outreach were found to be as varied as their attitudes about station funding in general. Many outreach activities have been financed directly through station operating budgets, especially for activities such as live local call-in shows broadcast subsequent to national PTOA programs, business breakfasts, and coordinating councils, etc. However, some stations increasingly are seeking outside funding for their local-

ly-initiated projects. For example, in the last three years, KCET has received about $750,000 in outside funding for outreach from businesses and foundations. KERA received support from several outside sources in cash and in-kind contributions for Project Crossroads. WGBY received a grant which covered about a third of the cost for its *Our Home Town* project. As a station policy, KET does not accept funding for programming directly from outside sources; however, the Martha's Army promotional campaign has been financed entirely through the efforts of the state's first lady to establish a separate war chest.

The total budgets for FY '88 and the sources of revenue for each of the six stations are included in Appendix G, Volume III. From this one can see the wide variation in source of revenue across these six sites. A station like KET derives 65% of its revenue from state and local government and only 10% from individuals. They meet the need of the local government by focusing on education issues. This is in stark contrast to KERA, WTVS, and KCET, each of which get less than 1% of their revenues from state or local government and therefore must depend on support from individuals, foundations, and businesses to operate the station. They must meet the needs of these audiences through outreach.

Outcomes from Outreach Activities

Little has been done to identify the effects of outreach in their communities by PBS stations. First, outreach other than production of local follow-up programming to PTOA national broadcasts only recently has begun to be conducted as a separately identifiable function (although one producer pointed out that it has been conducted in stations in one form or another for years). Second, even if outreach had been more developed, measuring its effects can be difficult, expensive, or labor intensive and station resources often are limited. Therefore, most information about effects is anecdotal. For example, when live call-in programs were broadcast, stations often were able to say that all of the phone lines were busy, but many did not keep count of the number of phone calls received and did not have resources available to follow-up with referral agencies to see what happened as a result.

Another desired effect is often increased awareness of a community issue, but measuring the effects of campaigns designed to increase awareness can be expensive, if done on a representative or systematic basis. At the next level, measuring attitude or behavior change or other more complex effects in a reliable and valid yet cost-efficient way has long eluded social science researchers. Nevertheless, from these it is possible to see that stations' local outreach has be-

come far more than just distribution of brochures or bumper stickers, but the level of effort and the results achieved are a function of the needs and resources in the local community and at the station.

In five out of the six markets (Dallas, Detroit, Kentucky, Los Angeles, and Springfield) the words "groundbreaking media collaboration" were mentioned by community leaders as well as station staff tc describe large-scale outreach efforts which had been planned and conducted by the station with other media and social service agencies in the community. Harnessing previously uncoordinated resources and directing them toward a particular objective to address a community need has been the role of community outreach. For example, in Dallas, almost all of the local television stations and 17 of the local radio stations aired promotional spots and newspapers printed editorials and feature stories for KERA's outreach effort to relieve racial tension. On the day of one of the major events, all three of the major network affiliates covered the event in their evening newscast. In Detroit, a commercial TV station and a radio station, in conjunction with newspapers, the schools, and many other social service agencies support a program to combat substance abuse among teenagers. Kentucky's campaign to increase the completion of high school equivalency diplomas spearheaded by the state's first lady has involved extensive media coverage and paid advertising including TV, radio, billboards, and print coverage in newspapers. A project by KCET directed toward teens used the satellite distribution system of Educational Television Network (ETN) to train teachers and school psychologists at 50 sites how to conduct sessions with teens about adolescent suicide. Springfield's WGBY joined forces with the local cable foundation for financial support and with the cable company itself for broadcast of local documentaries in topic areas deemed important to the community. "Firsts" in outreach program simulcasts in English and Spanish (on radio) were cited by two markets with large Hispanic populations, Albuquerque and Los Angeles. This was a new form of media collaboration initiated by the outreach departments in the stations.

Staff in all stations mentioned the importance of project promotion in media other than public television to reach outreach target audiences who currently may not be frequent public television viewers. Ideally, one of the effects of this is to broaden the public television station's audience. While no ratings figures were obtained, there are several indicators that this has happened.

KCET's CEO attributes in part a 9% increase in audience last year to the station's extensive outreach efforts. One of KCET's broadcast programs with outreach activities associated was Stand and Deliver. This program was promoted extensively in advance and in fact record-breaking ratings were achieved. Also, in

two markets (Kentucky and Dallas), none of the respondents in the home viewer survey said that they never watch the local PBS station; in other words, everyone said they watch at least some of the time. In a third market (Los Angeles) where there has been extensive outreach of a variety of forms, and where a situation of media overload exists, only 7% of the home viewers said they never watch KCET. The responses of community leaders are even more striking. Community leaders in four out of the six markets (Albuquerque, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Springfield) said that they watch their local public television station at least some of the time. In the other two markets, Detroit (6%) and Dallas (8%), few said they never watch public television. (While there are no sites in this study with no public television outreach to compare, other studies conducted by Research Communications, Ltd. have shown higher levels of no public television viewing.)

Outreach project media collaborations have resulted directly in benefits to the communities in awareness about community issues as identified in both the home viewer and community leader surveys. For example, Kentucky's statewide media campaign has resulted in almost total saturations of both the public and community leaders in recognition and awareness of both the problem of the state's low average educational level and KET's *GED On TV* program designed to combat the problem. The other sites have lower awareness levels among home viewers (about a fourth to a half), but their recognition among community leaders is about three-fourths or higher, which means that at least half of the community leaders who have not been involved with the station know about the project.

However, with the exception of KET, stations' involvement in outreach projects is less well-recognized among home viewers. Thus, while the stations are making considerable efforts, they are not always being credited for it and they have not distinguished themselves from other supporting organizations, including other television stations. In Albuquerque, Dallas, Detroit, and Los Angeles, recognition of the station's involvement in the most extensive or recent large-scale outreach project was about four out of ten. In Springfield, it was about half this level for a project which had been running for less than a year. Yet, in Kentucky, recognition of the station's involvement in *GED On TV* was close to 100% after five years and a recent extensive media campaign. Kentucky's example shows that length of campaign and breadth of coverage clearly make a significant difference in achieving awareness of the outreach issue and the station's involvement among both home viewers and community leaders.

In addition to problem recognition and awareness in communities (and possibly increased viewing by target audiences), outreach projects conducted in each of the six sites yielded other short and longer term results for viewers, the sta-

tions, and the communities. The details of these are included in the individual case studies and the results vary in magnitude, as do the projects themselves. Examples are outlined below for each site:

Los Angeles -- A simple "trailer" announcement following a health care program broadcast resulted in 15,000 requests for a durable power of attorney for a health care form which KCET offered to viewers in English and Spanish. Funders later supported other subsequent outreach activities and the station got a number of calls from medical institutions about ideas for other programs. Total station cost after community contributions: $450. This simplest of all KCET's outreach efforts also resulted in improved collaboration between the community outreach department and producers at the station, with producers requesting the help of outreach staff during planning stages.

Detroit -- Over half the public and parochial schools in southeastern Michigan participate in activities related to Project Graduation, a collaboration of over 30 organizations in the area. The project has encouraged leadership among teens. Informal feedback from high schools indicates that many Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD) chapters have been created as a result of Project Graduation activities (Michigan now has more chapters than any other state). Feedback from students also indicates that awareness of the hazards of substance abuse has increased, in part due to Project Graduation activities.

Dallas -- In addition to the extensive media collaboration achieved, KERA's Project Crossroads sponsored the largest congregation exchange in the nation's history, with 80 congregations and 2,000 people traveling to participate in religious exchange and dialogue about racial tensions. Leadership to combat racism has been established in the city, which may have been facilitated by KERA's efforts. Dialogue on this issue has been increased; however, some community leaders mentioned that more needs to be done.

Kentucky -- Since KET's GED On TV program began in 1985, more than 32,000 people have called KET's hotline number to inquire about the program. Approximately one-third of that number have enrolled in the programs and others have been referred to adult basic education. The program has a 52% retention rate and an 82% success rate among enrollees who take the examination. One year after the Martha's Army promotional campaign was initiated by the state's first lady, enrollment figures increased by 285%. A fall 1989 call-in program with Waylon Jennings resulted in 798 calls -- about twice as many calls as had ever been received during one program before.

Albuquerque -- KNME's local program production on domestic violence with a live local follow-up resulted in the Abused Women Shelter being "flooded"

with inquiries from women seeking help the night of the broadcast and shortly thereafter. Incidence reports to police tripled the night of the program and counseling requests increased dramatically. The issue, the program, and the station all received considerable press coverage prior to and immediately following the broadcast. The station's efforts on Child Care in New Mexico resulted in an increase of over 40 telephone calls per month to the community agency sponsor by parents looking for child care and an increase of two providers per week requesting information on starting their own family day care program.

Springfield, MA -- The results of WGBY's *Our Home Town* project are not in yet because the project is ongoing. The station has been getting a stream of requests for materials and videotapes; however, they feel that utilization would increase with more training workshops. Comments from community leaders were positive.

Because of the perceived overall impact on the community and the station, station managers in three (Detroit, Dallas, Kentucky) of the six sites said that if they were forced to choose due to resource constraints, that they would continue outreach programs rather than fund local programming. In two cases, outreach has become an integral part of local programming. The general manager in Springfield said that he expects that future programming and outreach efforts will be combined based on the model of *Our Home Town*. In Detroit, outreach also will be conducted through the station's *Club Connect* programming effort. Community outreach in Los Angeles has become a major station priority and the manager has recently been promoted to the director level. General managers in these stations feel that community outreach is a way to forge relationships with community leaders and organizations and to involve home viewers beyond passive viewing and are therefore building it into their programming.

Recommendations for Stations

1. Television has been proven to be effective in increasing levels of awareness about community issues or providing information about community resources. These roles are well-suited to the public service mission of public television stations. Providing community service messages or "trailers" following selected programming provides viewers with a service at minimal cost to the station (the opportunity cost of their time, the time required to screen agencies, and preparation of the chyrons) and should be considered by stations seeking expanded outreach activities.

2. Some stations have taken on a broader leadership role in the community -- stimulating community organization or action through their outreach ef-

forts. Sometimes organization and focusing of community resources are required as precursors for other changes to be able to take place in the community (coordination of literacy resources is an example). The PBS station can take on an effective role in coordinating other community agencies due to its position of neutrality, but outreach or "community development" of this type requires staff at the station who have appropriate qualifications and contacts within the community yet who are viewed as neutral partners to community agencies.

3. Development of the Community Advisory Board as an outreach resource for stations should be considered. The Community Advisory Board can be used effectively as a resource in planning and implementing outreach projects. Board members also can be used to establish linkages to other community agencies which are able to provide direct or in-kind funding for outreach projects, or who can help in establishing distribution sources for materials.

4. The importance of the support of station management and collaboration between the community outreach staff and program producers for achieving outreach objectives cannot be understated. Stations which do not have effective outreach might want to examine possible problems in these areas.

5. Not surprisingly, different outreach project designs yield different results. For example, a single issue covered over a long period of time with extensive media coverage (such as the case with KET) can lead to high penetration. A more scatter gun approach such as that of KCET yields different results -- affecting more diverse audiences. Each station needs to consider its objectives carefully and community and station needs and resources in determining the best outreach approach. Situations in which the target audience for the issue is narrow or the station's resources are limited have less dramatic results.

6. Project promotion on non-public television media has been shown to be effective in attracting recognition and viewing among target viewers who fall outside the existing loyal public television-viewing audience. Stations should consider using cable, radio, and print media for promotion of their outreach activities. Examples within the case studies show that these media organizations may be willing to provide promotion for public service projects gratis or on a low cost basis.

7. The competitive situation with the other stations in the market should be considered in planning outreach. Commercial stations, fraught with competition from cable and other media, increasingly are attempting to establish local service "franchises" within the community to differentiate themselves

and to attract viewers. The home viewer survey indicated that some commercial stations have been successful in creating this image. Although the surveys for this study indicated that the local public television stations often have a community involvement image among community leaders, this image does not exist to the same extent among home viewers, who are the source of station ratings and are often the backbone of station funding.

8. Community outreach does not always lead to positive image building for the station in projects where the station is one of several sponsors. When promotional materials cite too many sponsors, in some cases neither stations nor other community sponsors are credited for their outreach participation. While multiple sponsorship may be the approach that is required to get the project done or funded, the advantages and disadvantages should be weighed by the station. Having different organizations take the lead for individual activities or project components is one alternative to station-only sponsorship.

9. Outreach is considered to be one way of attracting outside funding for projects. Station staff claim that funders are particularly interested in projects which provide exposure beyond program production and broadcast.

10. Stations should continue to use Public Television Outreach Alliance (PTOA) resources as they fit their needs. PTOA resources are particularly important to smaller stations who need "turnkey" materials to be able to participate in outreach at all given their limited resources.

To order the three-volume set of reports on which this summary is based, please send your name and address with a check for $75.00 payable to Research Communications, Ltd., at 824 Boylston Street, Chestnut Hill, MA 02167.

Questions may be directed to Susan Young at Research Communications, Ltd., (617) 277-5183.

R4250-1.4 F 10/90

cpb **Research Notes**

June 1990 No. 36

PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS' INCOME FROM STATE GOVERNMENTS AND STATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES RANKED STATE-BY-STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1989

This report presents income from state governments or state colleges and universities and the combined income of the two state sources for each state, as reported by public broadcasting licensees to CPB in the Annual Financial Report survey, Fiscal Year 1989.

These data are intended to be a "best available" tool for use in advocacy with state budgeting authorities or legislative funding committees.

The total contributions of state governments and of state colleges and universities accounted for 24.7 percent of total public broadcasting income in Fiscal Year 1989, according to preliminary data from the latest financial survey. State contributions to public broadcasting, however, varied greatly among states, ranging from none to $28.2 million for public television and to $5.7 million for public radio in FY 1989.

The state contributions contained in this report, however, do not actually measure appropriations or expenditures by state governments on behalf of public broadcasting during the fiscal year. To our knowledge, no one collects such data on a regular basis from all state governments.

If you have questions about these data, please contact Young Lee (202) 879-9674. We also welcome any comments and recommendations about how to make the data more useful to you.

Table 1
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING
STATE INCOME ANALYSIS FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Income includes cash and inkind income only.)

State	——Total State Government Income—— State Government Income	Ranked by State Government Income	Per Capita State Government Income	Ranked by Per Capita State Government Income	State College & University Income	-Total State Government, College & Univ. Income- Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Inc.
Alabama	3,702,253	18	0.90	30	0	3,702,253	24	0.90	32
Alaska	3,121,985	23	5.96	2	220,404	3,342,389	27	6.38	2
Arizona	237,970	44	0.07	41	3,170,734	3,408,704	25	0.98	30
Arkansas	2,439,599	28	1.02	25	0	2,439,599	33	1.02	28
California	1,003,933	37	0.04	44	2,268,220	3,272,153	28	0.12	45
Colorado	40,973	45	0.01	45	310,258	351,231	47	0.11	46
Connecticut	3,157,200	22	0.98	27	8,604	3,165,804	29	0.98	29
D.C.	0	49	0.00	49	0	0	50	0.00	48
Delaware	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
Florida	11,605,776	6	0.94	28	2,255,415	13,861,191	4	1.12	25
Georgia	10,674,485	7	1.68	13	0	10,674,485	9	1.68	16
Hawaii	4,568,515	16	4.16	3	171,771	4,740,286	18	4.32	4
Idaho	2,085,201	29	2.08	11	351,773	2,436,974	34	2.43	10
Illinois	3,183,424	21	0.27	36	2,035,549	5,218,973	17	0.45	38
Indiana	2,537,503	27	0.46	34	2,186,545	4,724,048	19	0.85	33
Iowa	6,492,188	11	2.29	10	12,384	6,504,572	14	2.30	11
Kansas	768,764	38	0.31	35	0	768,764	44	0.31	39
Kentucky	10,272,381	8	2.76	7	567,129	10,839,510	8	2.91	6
Louisiana	4,009,849	17	0.91	29	0	4,009,849	21	0.91	31
Maine	1,429,668	33	1.19	21	349,282	1,778,950	38	1.48	21
Maryland	12,818,593	4	2.77	6	0	12,818,593	6	2.77	7
Massachusetts	1,405,849	34	0.24	38	26,393	1,432,242	40	0.24	42
Michigan	439,999	41	0.05	43	5,072,042	5,512,041	15	0.60	36
Minnesota	1,120,869	36	0.26	37	192,749	1,313,618	42	0.30	40
Mississippi	5,266,847	14	2.01	12	1,067	5,267,914	16	2.01	12
Missouri	288,372	43	0.06	42	486,467	774,839	43	0.15	43
Montana	5,159	48	0.01	45	215,582	220,741	48	0.27	41
Nebraska	5,824,702	13	3.64	4	1,250,306	7,075,008	13	4.42	3
Nevada	8,003	47	0.01	45	54,599	62,602	49	0.06	47
New Hampshire	1,799,208	30	1.66	15	0	1,799,208	37	1.66	17
New Jersey	12,857,431	3	1.67	14	110,657	12,968,088	5	1.68	16
New Mexico	1,756,820	31	1.17	22	936,122	2,692,942	32	1.79	15
New York	26,171,543	2	1.46	19	102,974	26,274,517	2	1.47	22
North Carolina	506,556	40	0.08	39	9,534,948	10,041,504	10	1.55	19
North Dakota	510,637	39	0.77	32	2,045	512,682	45	0.77	35
Ohio	8,487,736	10	0.78	31	3,615,471	12,103,207	7	1.11	26
Oklahoma	3,413,202	19	1.05	24	303,933	3,717,135	23	1.15	24
Oregon	2,971,885	24	1.07	23	10,240	2,982,125	30	1.08	27
Pennsylvania	12,007,615	5	1.00	26	2,431,754	14,439,369	3	1.20	23
Rhode Island	1,583,592	32	1.59	17	59,147	1,642,739	39	1.65	18
South Carolina	27,991,427	1	8.07	1	125,649	28,117,076	1	8.10	1
South Dakota	2,547,805	26	3.57	5	207,100	2,754,905	31	3.86	5
Tennessee	3,401,558	20	0.69	33	349,170	3,750,728	22	0.77	35
Texas	28,372	46	*	48	2,219,590	2,247,962	36	0.13	44
Utah	2,731,186	25	1.62	16	639,017	3,370,203	26	1.99	13
Vermont	1,330,370	35	2.39	9	30,924	1,361,294	41	2.44	9
Virginia	8,934,146	9	1.49	18	343,573	9,277,719	11	1.54	20
Washington	363,099	42	0.08	39	2,003,259	2,366,358	35	0.51	37
West Virginia	4,631,426	15	2.47	8	1,726	4,633,152	20	2.47	8
Wisconsin	6,432,691	12	1.32	20	2,472,924	8,905,615	12	1.83	14
Wyoming	0	49	0.00	49	372,715	372,715	46	0.78	34
American Samoa	928,449		29.01		0.00	928,449		29.01	
Guam	122,130		1.15		0.00	122,130		1.15	
Puerto Rico	3,322,982		1.04		3,599.00	3,326,581		1.04	
Virgin Islands	4,780		0.05		3,720.00	8,500		0.09	
Grand Total	233,346,706		~~1.85~~ 0.94		47,087,530.00	280,434,236		~~2.28~~ 1.13	

* Less than $0.05.
Note: A state without a public radio grantee is not ranked, and is noted as "n/a".
Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

Table 2
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING
STATE INCOME ANALYSIS FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Income includes cash, inkind and indirect income.)

State	——Total State Government Income—— State Government Income	Ranked by State Government Income	Per Capita State Government Income	Ranked by Per Capita State Government Income	State College & University Income	-Total State Government, College & Univ. Income- Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Inc.
Alabama	3,756,873	18	0.92	29	0	3,756,873	27	0.92	33
Alaska	3,121,985	23	5.96	2	553,545	3,675,530	30	7.01	2
Arizona	237,970	44	0.07	41	4,639,725	4,877,695	21	1.40	24
Arkansas	2,439,599	28	1.02	25	0	2,439,599	36	1.02	31
California	1,003,933	37	0.04	44	4,807,986	5,811,919	17	0.21	46
Colorado	40,973	45	0.01	45	310,258	351,231	48	0.11	48
Connecticut	3,157,200	22	0.98	27	8,604	3,165,804	31	0.98	32
D.C.	0	49	0.00	49	0	0	50	0.00	50
Delaware	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
Florida	11,605,776	6	0.94	28	4,875,810	16,481,586	3	1.34	25
Georgia	10,674,485	7	1.68	14	0	10,674,485	9	1.68	20
Hawaii	5,145,360	15	4.69	3	171,771	5,317,131	19	4.84	3
Idaho	2,085,201	29	2.08	11	351,773	2,436,974	37	2.43	11
Illinois	3,183,424	21	0.27	36	2,545,801	5,729,225	18	0.49	41
Indiana	2,537,503	27	0.46	34	3,443,657	5,981,160	16	1.08	30
Iowa	6,682,502	11	2.36	10	12,384	6,694,886	15	2.36	13
Kansas	768,764	38	0.31	35	0	768,764	44	0.31	42
Kentucky	10,272,381	8	2.76	7	765,717	11,038,098	8	2.96	7
Louisiana	4,009,849	17	0.91	30	0	4,009,849	24	0.91	35
Maine	1,429,668	33	1.19	21	825,509	2,255,177	38	1.87	18
Maryland	13,120,284	4	2.84	6	0	13,120,284	7	2.84	8
Massachusetts	1,405,849	34	0.24	38	26,393	1,432,242	41	0.24	45
Michigan	439,999	41	0.05	43	7,722,340	8,162,339	13	0.88	36
Minnesota	1,120,869	36	0.26	37	192,749	1,313,618	42	0.30	43
Mississippi	5,290,748	14	2.02	12	1,067	5,291,815	20	2.02	16
Missouri	288,372	43	0.06	42	631,758	920,130	43	0.18	47
Montana	5,159	48	0.01	45	456,577	461,736	46	0.57	40
Nebraska	5,841,831	13	3.65	4	1,657,850	7,499,681	14	4.68	4
Nevada	8,003	47	0.01	45	54,599	62,602	49	0.06	49
New Hampshire	1,799,208	30	1.66	15	779,690	2,578,898	35	2.38	12
New Jersey	14,691,652	3	1.90	13	110,657	14,802,309	5	1.92	17
New Mexico	1,756,820	31	1.17	22	1,960,382	3,717,202	29	2.47	10
New York	26,171,543	2	1.46	19	102,974	26,274,517	2	1.47	23
North Carolina	506,556	40	0.08	39	10,000,369	10,506,925	10	1.62	21
North Dakota	510,637	39	0.77	32	2,045	512,682	45	0.77	37
Ohio	8,487,736	10	0.78	31	5,086,962	13,574,698	6	1.25	27
Oklahoma	3,413,202	19	1.05	24	400,626	3,813,828	26	1.18	28
Oregon	2,971,885	24	1.07	23	10,240	2,982,125	32	1.08	29
Pennsylvania	12,007,615	5	1.00	26	3,501,024	15,508,639	4	1.29	26
Rhode Island	1,619,030	32	1.63	16	59,147	1,678,177	40	1.69	19
South Carolina	28,065,291	1	8.09	1	125,649	28,190,940	1	8.12	1
South Dakota	2,547,805	26	3.57	5	207,100	2,754,905	33	3.86	5
Tennessee	3,401,558	20	0.69	33	349,170	3,750,728	28	0.77	37
Texas	28,372	46	*	48	4,335,725	4,364,097	23	0.26	44
Utah	2,731,186	25	1.62	17	1,107,524	3,838,710	25	2.27	14
Vermont	1,330,370	35	2.39	9	655,663	1,986,033	39	3.57	6
Virginia	8,934,146	9	1.49	18	343,573	9,277,719	12	1.54	22
Washington	363,099	42	0.08	39	2,349,768	2,712,867	34	0.58	39
West Virginia	4,681,146	16	2.50	8	1,726	4,682,872	22	2.50	9
Wisconsin	6,432,691	12	1.32	20	3,614,884	10,047,575	11	2.07	15
Wyoming	0	49	0.00	49	440,180	440,180	47	0.92	33
American Samoa	982,980		30.72		0.00	982,980		30.72	
Guam	122,130		1.15		0.00	122,130		1.15	
Puerto Rico	3,322,982		1.04		3,599.00	3,326,581		1.04	
Virgin Islands	4,780		0.05		3,720.00	8,500		0.09	
Grand Total	236,558,980		~~1.86~~ 0.95		69,608,270.00	306,167,250		~~2.40~~ 1.23	

* Less than $0.05.
Note: A state without a public radio grantee is not ranked, and is noted as "n/a".
Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

Table 3
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING
STATE INCOME ANALYSIS FOR PUBLIC RADIO GRANTEES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Income includes cash and inkind income only.)

State	——Total State Government Income—— State Government Income	Ranked by State Government Income	Per Capita State Government Income	Ranked by Per Capita State Government Income	State College & University Income	-Total State Government, College & Univ. Income- Total Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ranked by Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Inc.
Alabama	464,125	14	0.11	14	707,352	1,171,477	18	0.29	22
Alaska	4,281,518	1	8.17	1	162,639	4,444,157	2	8.00	1
Arizona	81,829	26	0.02	24	1,610,562	1,692,391	11	0.49	7
Arkansas	3,467	42	*	42	289,788	293,255	38	0.12	36
California	81,336	27	*	39	1,697,342	1,778,678	9	0.06	41
Colorado	1,500	43	*	43	445,048	446,548	31	0.14	32
Connecticut	495,101	13	0.15	10	2,760	497,861	30	0.15	31
D.C.	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Delaware	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
Florida	4,214,940	2	0.34	4	1,281,837	5,496,777	1	0.45	9
Georgia	38,335	33	0.01	30	178,476	216,811	41	0.03	43
Hawaii	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Idaho	0	44	0.00	44	275,565	275,565	39	0.27	23
Illinois	1,273,435	5	0.11	14	2,163,394	3,436,829	4	0.30	20
Indiana	90,574	24	0.02	24	1,415,702	1,506,276	13	0.27	23
Iowa	392,943	16	0.14	11	2,480,811	2,873,754	6	1.01	2
Kansas	93,933	23	0.04	20	1,257,515	1,351,448	16	0.54	6
Kentucky	8,052	40	*	41	1,494,592	1,502,644	14	0.40	10
Louisiana	163,432	20	0.04	20	408,592	572,024	26	0.13	34
Maine	655,990	9	0.54	2	73,481	729,471	23	0.61	5
Maryland	32,876	34	0.01	30	401,819	434,695	32	0.09	37
Massachusetts	17,940	37	*	38	327,271	345,211	37	0.06	41
Michigan	202,603	19	0.02	24	2,543,519	2,746,122	8	0.30	20
Minnesota	227,770	18	0.05	19	1,199,031	1,426,801	15	0.33	14
Mississippi	751,042	7	0.29	7	308,057	1,059,099	19	0.40	10
Missouri	14,397	38	*	40	1,752,770	1,767,167	10	0.34	13
Montana	8,408	39	0.01	30	240,756	249,164	40	0.31	19
Nebraska	88,967	25	0.06	17	119,030	207,997	42	0.13	34
Nevada	39,427	32	0.04	20	131,315	170,742	43	0.16	28
New Hampshire	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
New Jersey	434,863	15	0.06	17	75,285	510,148	29	0.07	38
New Mexico	0	44	0.00	44	404,353	404,353	34	0.27	23
New York	2,211,801	3	0.12	13	641,549	2,853,350	7	0.16	28
North Carolina	150,980	21	0.02	24	786,962	937,942	20	0.14	32
North Dakota	23,426	36	0.04	20	394,896	418,322	33	0.63	4
Ohio	810,586	6	0.07	16	3,573,419	4,384,005	3	0.40	10
Oklahoma	40,045	31	0.01	30	573,235	613,280	24	0.19	26
Oregon	674,204	8	0.24	8	240,533	914,737	21	0.33	14
Pennsylvania	58,737	28	*	36	16,513	75,250	44	0.01	44
Rhode Island	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
South Carolina	559,618	12	0.16	9	0	559,618	27	0.16	28
South Dakota	323,931	17	0.45	3	25,427	349,358	36	0.49	7
Tennessee	614,750	10	0.13	12	931,568	1,546,318	12	0.32	16
Texas	58,213	29	*	37	1,150,728	1,208,941	17	0.07	38
Utah	28,489	35	0.02	24	515,127	543,616	28	0.32	16
Vermont	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Virginia	55,000	30	0.01	30	349,125	404,125	35	0.07	38
Washington	114,895	22	0.02	24	674,394	789,289	22	0.17	27
West Virginia	597,347	11	0.32	5	0	597,347	25	0.32	16
Wisconsin	1,493,998	4	0.31	6	1,814,317	3,308,315	5	0.68	3
Wyoming	3,814	41	0.01	30	0	3,814	45	0.01	44
American Samoa	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Guam	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Puerto Rico	0		0.00		297,705	297,705		0.09	
Virgin Islands	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Grand Total	21,978,637		0.09		35,434,160	57,412,797		0.23	

* Less than $0.05.
Note: A state without a public radio grantee is not ranked, and is noted as "n/a".
Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

Table 4

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

STATE INCOME ANALYSIS FOR PUBLIC RADIO GRANTEES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1989

(Income includes cash, inkind and indirect income.)

State	——Total State Government Income—— State Government Income	Ranked by State Government Income	Per Capita State Government Income	Per Capita State Government Income	State College & University Income	-Total State Government, College & Univ. Income- Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Income	Per Capita Ttl. State Govt., Coll. & Univ. Inc.
Alabama	469,527	14	0.11	14	1,222,522	1,692,049	18	0.41	16
Alaska	4,281,518	1	8.17	1	315,737	4,597,255	3	8.77	1
Arizona	81,829	26	0.02	24	2,282,639	2,364,468	11	0.68	6
Arkansas	3,467	42	*	42	442,001	445,468	37	0.19	31
California	81,336	27	*	39	3,886,487	3,967,823	7	0.14	38
Colorado	1,500	43	*	43	571,544	573,044	30	0.17	34
Connecticut	495,101	13	0.15	10	2,760	497,861	35	0.15	37
D.C.	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Delaware	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
Florida	4,214,940	2	0.34	4	2,627,235	6,842,175	1	0.55	8
Georgia	38,335	33	0.01	30	178,476	216,811	43	0.03	44
Hawaii	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Idaho	0	44	0.00	44	348,025	348,025	40	0.35	23
Illinois	1,273,435	5	0.11	14	2,962,271	4,235,706	4	0.36	21
Indiana	90,574	24	0.02	24	1,641,269	1,731,843	15	0.31	25
Iowa	392,943	16	0.14	11	2,831,560	3,224,503	8	1.14	2
Kansas	93,933	23	0.04	20	1,606,690	1,700,623	17	0.68	6
Kentucky	8,052	40	*	41	1,956,811	1,964,863	13	0.53	9
Louisiana	163,432	20	0.04	20	766,033	929,465	24	0.21	28
Maine	655,990	9	0.54	2	328,478	984,468	23	0.82	4
Maryland	32,876	34	0.01	30	504,367	537,243	32	0.12	41
Massachusetts	17,940	37	*	38	785,912	803,852	25	0.14	38
Michigan	202,603	19	0.02	24	3,935,213	4,137,816	5	0.45	13
Minnesota	227,770	18	0.05	19	1,497,917	1,725,687	16	0.40	17
Mississippi	751,042	7	0.29	7	424,070	1,175,112	20	0.45	13
Missouri	14,397	38	*	40	2,479,723	2,494,120	10	0.49	19
Montana	8,408	39	0.01	30	351,431	359,839	38	0.45	13
Nebraska	88,967	25	0.06	17	199,708	288,675	41	0.18	32
Nevada	39,427	32	0.04	20	179,168	218,595	42	0.21	28
New Hampshire	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
New Jersey	434,863	15	0.06	17	75,285	510,148	34	0.07	43
New Mexico	0	44	0.00	44	581,192	581,192	29	0.39	19
New York	2,211,801	3	0.12	13	806,250	3,018,051	9	0.17	34
North Carolina	150,980	21	0.02	24	1,120,428	1,271,408	19	0.20	30
North Dakota	23,426	36	0.04	20	467,444	490,870	36	0.74	5
Ohio	810,586	6	0.07	16	4,930,322	5,740,908	2	0.53	9
Oklahoma	40,045	31	0.01	30	732,673	772,718	26	0.24	26
Oregon	674,204	8	0.24	8	424,161	1,098,365	21	0.40	17
Pennsylvania	58,737	28	*	36	16,513	75,250	45	0.01	45
Rhode Island	0	n/a	0.00	n/a	0	0	n/a	0.00	n/a
South Carolina	559,618	12	0.16	9	0	559,618	31	0.16	36
South Dakota	323,931	17	0.45	3	25,427	349,358	39	0.49	11
Tennessee	614,750	10	0.13	12	1,145,720	1,760,470	14	0.36	21
Texas	58,213	29	*	37	2,077,954	2,136,167	12	0.13	40
Utah	28,489	35	0.02	24	626,435	654,924	27	0.39	19
Vermont	0	44	0.00	44	0	0	46	0.00	46
Virginia	55,000	30	0.01	30	474,257	529,257	33	0.09	42
Washington	114,895	22	0.02	24	885,834	1,000,729	22	0.22	27
West Virginia	605,485	11	0.32	5	0	605,485	28	0.32	24
Wisconsin	1,493,998	4	0.31	6	2,556,059	4,050,057	6	0.83	3
Wyoming	3,814	41	0.01	30	81,158	84,972	44	0.18	32
American Samoa	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Guam	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Puerto Rico	0		0.00		378,147	378,147		0.00	
Virgin Islands	0		0.00		0	0		0.00	
Grand Total	21,522,650		0.09		50,510,784	72,033,434		0.29	

* Less than $0.05.

Note: A state without a public radio grantee is not ranked, and is noted as "n/a".

Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

R4250-1.5F 10/90

cpb **Research Notes**

June 1990 No. 37

AVERAGE REVENUE PROFILES FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Average Fiscal Year 1989 revenue profiles are presented for public radio and television stations within four licensee-type and various operating budget size categories in this report.

These profiles are designed to permit stations to compare the sources and amounts of income they receive with those of similar stations.

Revenue data contained in this report represent gross income, including cash, in-kind and indirect income, and were collected through the CPB Annual Financial Report survey. In-kind income refers to noncash support for public broadcasting stations from outside (i.e., other than the licensee) sources; indirect income refers to noncash support from the parent licensee of the broadcasting station.

If you have questions about these data, please refer them to Young Lee (202) 879-9674. We also welcome any comments and recommendations about how to make the data more useful to you.

Table 1

AVERAGE GRANTEE REVENUE PROFILES FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES
BY LICENSEE TYPE, OPERATION BUDGET SIZE AND INCOME SOURCE, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Income Source	Community		University		Local Authority		State		All Licensees	
LARGE GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES ($10 MILLION AND OVER IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	774,895	2%	-	2%	-	-	269,887	1%	597,607	2%
CPB-CSG	1,885,540	5%	-	8%	-	-	1,380,720	7%	1,681,333	5%
CPB NPPAG and Other	2,141,216	5%	-	9%	-	-	119,114	1%	1,525,943	5%
Annenberg/CPB Proj.	320,845	1%	-	0%	-	-	6,027	*	204,225	1%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	3,927,749	10%	-	9%	-	-	347,900	2%	2,711,257	8%
Local Government	234,636	1%	-	3%	-	-	30,777	*	196,292	1%
State Government	1,567,841	4%	-	3%	-	-	14,220,386	68%	4,773,130	15%
State College	61,964	*	-	39%	-	-	52,636	*	666,351	2%
Other Public College	3,590	*	-	1%	-	-	22,614	*	16,231	*
Private College	75,895	*	-	*	-	-	316	*	48,070	*
Foundation	2,751,634	7%	-	1%	-	-	1,131,762	5%	2,056,976	6%
Business	11,164,976	28%	-	5%	-	-	466,992	2%	7,258,518	23%
Subscription	10,565,076	27%	-	16%	-	-	1,586,462	8%	7,341,649	23%
Auction	284,281	1%	-	1%	-	-	1,688	*	191,821	1%
All Other	4,146,266	10%	-	4%	-	-	1,307,121	6%	3,026,213	9%
Total	39,906,405	100%	-	100%	-	-	20,944,401	100%	32,295,616	100%
(Number of Grantees)	12		2		0		5		19	
LARGE MID-SIZED GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES ($4 MILLION - $9.9 MILLION IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	58,591	1%	73,262	1%	-	0%	118,136	1%	73,438	1%
CPB-CSG	818,662	10%	758,867	10%	-	9%	815,248	10%	797,175	10%
CPB NPPAG and Other	82,571	1%	33,575	*	-	*	17,351	*	50,065	1%
Annenberg/CPB Proj.	0	0%	5,000	0%	-	0%	0	0%	1,800	*
Public Brdcstg Ent.	203,105	3%	147,914	2%	-	*	15,660	*	138,641	2%
Local Government	72,695	1%	678,742	9%	-	74%	89,736	1%	558,543	7%
State Government	1,342,534	17%	554,801	7%	-	14%	4,791,753	56%	1,746,168	21%
State College	18,740	*	1,780,341	22%	-	0%	125,055	2%	673,430	8%
Other Public College	46,131	1%	5,311	*	-	0%	8,216	*	22,008	*
Private College	4,321	*	624,458	8%	-	0%	275	*	226,589	3%
Foundation	306,732	4%	104,287	1%	-	0%	414,648	5%	243,166	3%
Business	1,076,641	13%	570,723	7%	-	0%	311,067	4%	698,330	9%
Subscription	2,630,353	33%	1,827,056	23%	-	0%	1,322,359	16%	1,974,353	24%
Auction	437,111	6%	247,511	3%	-	0%	1,091	*	264,167	3%
All Other	907,455	11%	607,397	8%	-	2%	488,546	6%	685,762	8%
Total	8,005,640	100%	8,019,245	100%	-	100%	8,519,140	100%	8,153,633	100%
(Number of Grantees)	10		9		1		5		25	
SMALL MID-SIZED GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES ($2.5 M - $6 MILLION IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	60,372	2%	73,812	2%	33,262	1%	172,188	3%	78,182	2%
CPB-CSG	535,731	13%	532,429	12%	512,551	15%	471,183	9%	523,709	12%
CPB NPPAG and Other	13,786	*	15,973	*	3,611	*	15,251	*	13,800	*
Annenberg/CPB Proj.	0	0%	1,144	*	0	0%	0	0%	286	*
Public Brdcstg Ent.	41,508	1%	13,831	*	27,549	1%	3,845	*	28,024	1%
Local Government	150,269	4%	46,214	1%	1,728,980	51%	28,589	1%	222,443	5%
State Government	966,681	23%	713,517	17%	164,851	5%	3,171,377	63%	1,168,652	28%
State College	55,327	1%	1,149,739	27%	0	0%	23,574	1%	320,192	8%
Other Public College	6,786	*	55,138	1%	9,025	*	0	0%	18,040	*
Private College	4,844	*	284,633	7%	1,403	*	4	*	73,826	2%
Foundation	84,026	2%	95,539	2%	39,243	1%	68,438	1%	81,319	2%
Business	542,655	13%	361,732	8%	294,215	9%	186,054	4%	426,715	10%
Subscription	994,165	24%	712,565	17%	346,044	10%	543,938	11%	809,899	19%
Auction	217,727	5%	68,783	2%	90,113	3%	10,903	*	140,692	3%
All Other	451,327	11%	197,696	5%	149,110	4%	352,528	7%	351,168	8%
Total	4,125,204	100%	4,322,745	100%	3,399,957	100%	5,047,871	100%	4,256,949	100%
(Number of Grantees)	36		17		5		10		68	

Table 1 (Continued)
AVERAGE GRANTEE REVENUE PROFILES FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES
BY LICENSEE TYPE, OPERATION BUDGET SIZE AND INCOME SOURCE, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Income Source	Community		University		Local Authority		State		All Licensees	
SMALL GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES (UNDER $2.5 MILLION IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	62,619	4%	34,285	2%	0	0%	53,070	3%	47,528	3%
CPB-CSG	340,401	21%	321,096	20%	394,750	19%	334,223	21%	333,716	21%
CPB Other	8,714	1%	9,818	1%	10,311	1%	4,986	*	8,671	1%
Annenberg/CPB Proj.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	4,709	*	10,031	1%	931	*	2,470	*	6,385	*
Local Government	43,297	3%	14,896	1%	1,028,561	50%	97,004	6%	75,773	5%
State Government	283,585	18%	177,831	11%	80,648	4%	582,892	37%	277,402	17%
State College	13,298	1%	523,482	32%	16,064	1%	46,961	3%	223,644	14%
Other Public College	1,586	*	195,328	12%	794	*	1	*	79,294	5%
Private College	13,905	1%	509	*	0	0%	423	*	6,032	*
Foundation	47,722	3%	17,527	1%	9,278	1%	164,662	10%	51,277	3%
Business	199,260	13%	78,309	5%	46,265	2%	80,324	5%	127,582	8%
Subscription	334,913	21%	153,629	10%	323,883	16%	125,926	8%	230,970	14%
Auction	68,603	4%	10,882	1%	18,943	1%	2,423	*	33,872	2%
All Other	173,776	11%	77,739	5%	125,895	6%	85,404	5%	120,443	7%
Total	1,596,387	100%	1,625,362	100%	2,056,325	100%	1,580,769	100%	1,622,589	100%
(Number of Grantees)	34		33		3		12		82	
ALL GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES (ALL OPERATING BUDGET SIZES):										
Federal-Direct	154,207	2%	61,507	2%	18,479	1%	134,339	2%	115,485	2%
CPB-CSG	670,359	8%	473,648	13%	509,302	14%	615,698	9%	592,019	9%
CPB Other	296,879	4%	59,024	2%	9,554	*	27,958	*	164,402	3%
Annenberg/CPB Proj.	41,849	1%	1,057	*	0	0%	942	*	20,334	*
Public Brdcstg Ent.	552,374	7%	74,406	2%	18,444	1%	58,934	1%	295,923	5%
Local Government	113,308	1%	133,539	4%	2,045,539	57%	64,141	1%	201,199	3%
State Government	833,498	10%	389,588	10%	260,343	7%	4,180,287	62%	1,219,376	19%
State College	36,683	*	1,057,336	28%	5,355	*	52,742	1%	358,806	6%
Other Public College	8,724	*	124,315	3%	5,278	*	4,818	*	44,265	1%
Private College	17,403	*	171,749	5%	779	*	252	*	62,334	1%
Foundation	442,765	5%	58,119	2%	24,894	1%	324,762	5%	282,970	4%
Business	1,859,310	23%	253,562	7%	178,875	5%	209,835	3%	1,004,373	16%
Subscription	2,176,754	26%	629,590	17%	300,208	8%	671,706	10%	1,354,963	21%
Auction	195,143	2%	65,259	2%	56,377	2%	4,750	*	116,460	2%
All Other	880,282	11%	206,558	6%	142,604	4%	422,764	6%	558,752	9%
Total	8,279,541	100%	3,759,257	100%	3,576,031	100%	6,773,926	100%	6,391,662	100%
(Number of Grantees)	92		61		9		32		194	

*Less than 0.5 percent.
Note: A sum of items may not add up to a total due to rounding. All financial data in this table are preliminary.
Data for a category represented by less than three grantees are not presented in this table.
Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

Table 2

AVERAGE GRANTEE REVENUE PROFILES FOR PUBLIC RADIO GRANTEES BY LICENSEE TYPE, OPERATION BUDGET SIZE AND INCOME SOURCE, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Income Source	Community		University		Local Authhority		State		All Licensees	
LARGE GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES ($1,000,000 AND OVER IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	13,575	1%	5,600	*	3,199	*	66,959	3%	10,914	1%
CPB-CSG	185,227	10%	197,338	11%	341,688	11%	233,033	12%	204,376	11%
CPB-NPPAG	48,463	3%	60,337	4%	109,075	4%	73,315	4%	60,073	3%
CPB-Annenberg & Other	54,161	3%	17,545	1%	5,883	*	32,975	2%	30,065	2%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	68,829	4%	51,148	3%	28,611	1%	45,141	2%	55,468	3%
Local Government	10,092	1%	11,198	1%	1,373,284	45%	14,326	1%	101,762	6%
State Government	85,910	5%	100,360	6%	226,254	7%	603,922	30%	126,156	7%
State College	1,194	*	406,617	23%	0	0%	21,841	1%	222,762	12%
Other Public College	1,783	*	23,542	1%	0	0%	7	*	13,432	1%
Private College	5,775	*	112,958	7%	1,855	*	4	*	63,612	3%
Foundation	107,652	6%	28,844	2%	67,732	2%	289,322	14%	70,158	4%
Business	282,504	16%	235,742	14%	211,235	7%	226,691	11%	249,813	13%
Subscription	539,377	30%	379,853	22%	580,034	19%	375,832	19%	447,967	24%
Auction	15,849	1%	690	*	0	0%	171	*	5,842	*
All Other	457,348	25%	122,144	7%	94,684	3%	67,450	3%	233,342	13%
Total	1,823,578	100%	1,736,371	100%	3,037,651	100%	2,018,012	100%	1,865,678	100%
(Number of Licensees)	31		49		6		4		90	
MID-SIZED GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES ($500,000 - $999,999 IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	16,510	2%	5,414	1%	0	0%	21,807	3%	8,629	1%
CPB-CSG	103,379	13%	110,179	14%	109,529	14%	99,937	13%	108,009	14%
CPB-NPPAG	23,693	3%	26,807	3%	29,525	4%	20,716	3%	25,877	3%
CPB-Annenberg & Other	16,925	2%	3,191	*	1,419	*	500	*	6,092	1%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	17,811	2%	5,501	1%	2,389	*	1,511	*	7,939	1%
Local Government	13,534	2%	2,347	*	447,061	57%	64	*	25,950	3%
State Government	98,261	13%	29,183	4%	9,778	1%	381,953	48%	64,206	8%
State College	1,414	*	277,554	35%	0	0%	4,238	1%	185,601	23%
Other Public College	52	*	30,286	4%	0	0%	5	*	20,203	3%
Private College	38	*	59,278	7%	0	0%	3	*	39,527	5%
Foundation	15,542	2%	7,954	1%	5,113	1%	105,430	13%	15,123	2%
Business	171,566	22%	114,401	14%	79,393	10%	60,439	8%	122,716	15%
Subscription	234,600	30%	98,023	12%	69,562	9%	86,474	11%	127,226	16%
Auction	24,349	3%	386	*	0	0%	114	*	5,829	1%
All Other	61,797	8%	34,621	4%	27,268	4%	15,248	2%	39,375	5%
Total	782,545	100%	801,936	100%	779,618	100%	797,938	100%	796,212	100%
(Number of Licensees)	24		70		5		6		105	
SMALL GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES UNDER $500,000 IN OPERATING BUDGET):										
Federal-Direct	4,800	1%	2,801	1%	0	0%	10,707	3%	3,528	1%
CPB-CSG	54,033	14%	51,598	11%	65,546	15%	26,102	7%	52,910	12%
CPB-NPPAG	11,790	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4,359	1%
CPB-Annenberg & Other	5,048	1%	8,455	2%	13,773	3%	8,077	2%	7,588	2%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	559	*	29,121	6%	5,870	1%	19,773	5%	16,566	4%
Local Government	5,447	1%	1,504	*	164,287	38%	0	0%	15,235	4%
State Government	58,478	15%	19,114	4%	3,363	1%	29,656	8%	32,743	8%
State College	457	*	188,768	41%	11,558	3%	60,009	16%	102,492	24%
Other Public College	0	0%	17,467	4%	0	0%	0	0%	9,247	2%
Private College	2,367	1%	16,011	3%	0	0%	559	*	9,366	2%
Foundation	19,626	5%	9,585	2%	7,944	2%	151,009	41%	16,739	4%
Business	84,749	22%	66,673	14%	73,827	17%	31,499	9%	73,011	17%
Subscription	76,613	20%	34,102	7%	41,518	10%	26,282	7%	50,184	12%
Auction	4,778	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1,767	*
All Other	59,159	15%	19,191	4%	50,063	11%	4,573	1%	35,935	8%
Total	387,906	100%	464,389	100%	437,750	100%	368,245	100%	431,671	100%
(Number of Licensees)	44		63		9		3		119	
ALL GRANTEES' AVERAGE REVENUES (ALL OPERATING BUDGET SIZES):										
Federal-Direct	10,387	1%	4,559	1%	960	*	33,138	3%	7,351	1%
CPB-CSG	107,076	12%	113,367	12%	159,384	12%	123,851	12%	114,749	12%
CPB-NPPAG	26,159	3%	26,555	3%	40,104	3%	32,120	3%	27,524	3%
CPB-Annenberg & Other	23,306	3%	8,878	1%	8,318	1%	12,241	1%	13,530	1%
Public Brdcstg Ent.	26,119	3%	25,967	3%	11,822	1%	19,150	2%	24,832	3%
Local Government	8,862	1%	4,438	1%	597,680	46%	4,437	*	43,619	5%
State Government	76,712	8%	44,860	5%	71,834	6%	368,952	34%	70,039	7%
State College	920	*	281,568	30%	5,201	*	22,524	2%	164,756	17%
Other Public College	571	*	24,033	3%	0	0%	4	*	14,110	2%
Private College	2,870	*	58,753	6%	556	*	132	*	35,000	4%
Foundation	46,200	5%	14,143	2%	25,173	2%	172,530	16%	31,510	3%
Business	167,719	18%	130,549	14%	116,441	9%	104,915	10%	140,308	15%
Subscription	259,819	28%	151,774	16%	210,084	16%	161,617	15%	189,961	20%
Auction	12,989	1%	334	*	0	0%	105	*	4,293	*
All Other	184,484	20%	52,844	6%	57,751	4%	28,847	3%	93,667	10%
Total	933,130	100%	936,671	100%	1,303,187	100%	1,074,185	100%	964,593	100%
(Number of Licensees)	99		182		20		13		314	

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Note: A sum of items may not add up to a total due to rounding. All financial data in this table are preliminary.
Data for a category represented by less than three grantees are not presented in this table.

Source: CPB, Policy Development and Planning, June 1990

R4250-1.6

Research Notes

September 1990, No. 38

VIEWER AND LISTENER SUBSCRIPTION INCOME FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION AND RADIO GRANTEES FISCAL YEAR 1989

Subscription programs of public broadcasting stations (grantees) continue to show steady increases in terms of the amount of subscription income as well as in the number of individual contributors. Public support of public broadcasting has been gaining ground steadily and substantially, as reflected in the long-term success of subscription programs for public television and radio stations.

In Fiscal Year 1970, subscription income for public broadcasting amounted to a mere $7 million, or 5 percent of total industry income ($145 million). In FY 1983, for the first time in pubic broadcasting history, subscriptions became the largest single revenue source (19.5 percent or $175 million of $899 million in total income) out of 11 major categories of income sources identified for the industry. Since then, the share from subscriptions has continually increased through FY 1988, and, in FY 1989, it accounted for 21.1 percent ($322.5 million) of total industry income ($1.5 billion), down slightly from 21.7 percent in FY 1988.

This edition of *Research Notes* presents public television and radio station activities in terms of subscription income and subscribers through FY 1989, based on the CPB Annual Financial Report surveys.

Subscription Income and Subscribers of Public Broadcasting Stations Through 1989

For public television grantees, the number of subscribers increased from 236,000 in 1970 to 2.5 million in 1980, and it rose to 4.9 million in 1989 (Table 1).[1] In FY 1970, when the Corporation for Public Broadcasting conducted the industry survey for the first time, subscription income reached $6.4 million or 6.4 percent of total cash income, and, in FY 1989, it accounted for $263 million or 21.1 percent of cash income.

The per-person contribution also went up remarkably, from $27 in 1970 to nearly $53 in 1989.

Among those stations reporting subscription programs in FY 1989, subscription income ranged from a low of $5,200 to nearly $27 million.

For public radio grantees, the number of subscribers increased from 33,000 in 1970 to 487,000 in 1980, and it jumped to over 1.2 million in FY 1989 (Table 2).

Subscription income as a percentage of total cash income showed a steady increase from a low of 6.9 percent in 1973 to a high of 26.3 percent in FY 1986, and it slightly dropped to 24.5 percent in FY 1989. The per-person contribution increased from $27 in 1970 to nearly $49 in FY 1989.

Among the grantees reporting subscription programs in FY 1989, income from this source ranged from a few hundred dollars to over $1.7 million.

---

1 The earliest data available for television subscription are those for 1967, which were collected and reported by the first Carnegie Commission on Public Television. According to the Commission's 1967 survey, television subscription income amounted to $3.9 million, although the number of subscribers for that year is not available. Two subsequent years' data (1968-1969) were gathered and reported by the former National Association of Educational Broadcasters (Table 1). For those years, the subscriber counts are also not available.

Public Broadcasting Grantees and Subscription Programs

Of the 194 **television grantees** examined, all but 21 or 11 percent raised funds from subscriptions in 1989 (Table 3). In the early 1970's, most grantees that reported successful subscription programs were licensed to community organizations; however, numerous institutional licensees have developed subscription programs and have been successful in public fund-raising since then. For instance, among state-licensed television grantees, 31 percent (10 out of 32) had no subscription income in 1989, while more than 55 percent (or 16 grantees) reported no subscription income in 1980. Furthermore, out of these ten state-licensed grantees in 1989, seven were licensed to two state licensees, and one grantee's subscription income was reported by another jointly operated university-licensed grantee.

At the same time, more and more **public radio grantees** have raised funds directly from the public since 1970. In 1989, over 87 percent of the total 316 public radio grantees reported income from subscriptions, while only 71 percent of all public radio grantees reported having subscription contributions in FY 1980 (Table 4).

In general, grantees which did not have subscription income or grantees which were not particularly successful in subscription programs in 1989 had at least one of the following characteristics:

(1) They were institutional licensees;

(2) They were prohibited from or restricted in fund-raising directly from the public by state statutes or local ordinances;

(3) Some of them, although a few in number, raised monies from the public through "friends groups";

(4) They employed unusual financial accounting systems so that subscriptions might be reported by other jointly operated grantees, or underwent the drastic changes in funding mechanisms during the reporting period; or

(5) They were new grantees or otherwise had relatively small operating budgets.

Average Grantee Subscription Profiles for Fiscal Year 1989

For **public television**, the average grantee's subscription income and number of subscribers varied greatly according to operating budget size and licensee type in 1989, particularly for the largest budget category (Table 3).

Average subscription income and number of subscribers ranged from $126,000 and 2,400 in the small operating budget category (less than $2.5 million in operating budget) to nearly $7 million and 121,000, respectively, in the largest budget category ($6 million in operating budget).

Overall, community-licensed grantees led in subscription income, number of subscribers, and subscription as a percentage of total income.

Subscription income as a percentage of gross and cash income also varied among the grantees in the different budget and licensee categories.

Public radio average grantee's subscription profiles are shown in Table 4. Average subscription income and number of subscribers ranged from $26,000 and 500 (in the small "less than $600,000 in operating budget category") to nearly $540,000 and 14,000 (in the large "over $1 million in operating budget category"), respectively.

The differences in subscription characteristics by budget category and licensee type are similar to those for public television grantees, with the exception of local authority-licensed grantees in subscription income, and of the largest budget category, for number of subscribers.

If you have questions about the data contained in this report, please contact Young Lee at (202) 879-9674. We also welcome any comments and recommendations about how to make reporting of these data more useful to you.

Table 1
SUBSCRIPTION INCOME AND NUMBER OF SUBSCRIBERS
PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES, FISCAL YEAR 1967-1989

Fical Year	Subscription Income (In $000)	Subscription as % of Cash Income	Number of Subscribers (In 000)	Per Person Contribution	Total Cash Income (In $000)
1967	$3,866	7.10%	n/a	n/a	$54,324
1968	$5,358	8.00%	n/a	n/a	$66,719
1969	$5,747	6.80%	n/a	n/a	$84,928
1970	$6,413	6.40%	236	$27.17	$99,956
1971	$8,445	6.00%	257	$32.86	$140,816
1972	$10,357	6.60%	597	$17.35	$157,915
1973	$16,619	9.40%	772	$21.53	$175,892
1974	$20,906	10.50%	1,019	$20.52	$200,001
1975	$28,723	11.60%	1,315	$21.84	$248,062
1976	$37,887	13.00%	1,797	$21.08	$290,861
1977	$45,229	13.10%	1,889	$23.94	$344,378
1978	$55,105	14.30%	2,142	$25.73	$384,604
1979	$62,936	14.50%	2,297	$27.40	$432,676
1980	$73,799	14.90%	2,450	$30.12	$493,913
1981	$95,463	17.30%	2,500	$38.19	$551,366
1982	$120,081	20.00%	2,800	$42.89	$600,826
1983	$146,587	22.90%	3,300	$44.42	$639,959
1984	$158,029	23.00%	3,682	$42.92	$686,524
1985	$184,197	23.10%	3,973	$46.36	$797,039
1986	$199,741	24.50%	4,327	$46.16	$813,798
1987	$221,932	23.80%	4,466	$49.69	$931,996
1988	$242,241	24.40%	4,675	$51.82	$991,206
1989*	$263,451	24.10%	4,927	$53.47	$1,094,126

* Preliminary data.

Source: Corporation for Public Broadcasting- Policy Development and Planning
September 1990

Table 2
SUBSCRIPTION INCOME AND NUMBER OF SUBSCRIBERS
PUBLIC RADIO GRANTEES, FISCAL YEARS 1970-1989

Fical Year	Subscription Income (In $000)	Subscription as % of Cash Income	Number of Subscribers (In 000)	Per Person Contribution	Total Cash Income (In $000)
1970	$899	9.60%	33	$27.24	$9,377
1971	$973	8.00%	40	$24.33	$12,127
1972	$1,110	7.20%	53	$20.94	$15,421
1973	$1,296	6.90%	64	$20.25	$18,802
1974	$1,969	9.00%	100	$19.69	$21,778
1975	$3,524	13.20%	190	$18.55	$26,708
1976	$4,412	13.30%	222	$19.87	$33,265
1977	$5,376	12.40%	257	$20.92	$43,458
1978	$7,211	13.90%	317	$22.75	$51,951
1979	$9,685	15.50%	402	$24.09	$62,478
1980	$12,095	15.20%	487	$24.84	$79,547
1981	$16,103	17.10%	606	$26.57	$94,298
1982	$21,963	20.00%	670	$32.78	$109,903
1983	$28,882	23.60%	850	$33.98	$122,168
1984	$34,865	25.80%	919	$37.94	$135,254
1985	$40,200	25.40%	979	$41.06	$158,035
1986	$45,873	26.30%	1,088	$42.16	$174,692
1987	$52,093	24.70%	1,185	$43.96	$210,659
1988	$54,842	24.60%	1,178	$46.56	$222,990
1989*	$59,801	24.50%	1,225	$48.82	$243,841

* Preliminary data.

Source: Corporation for Public Broadcasting- Policy Development and Planning
September 1990

Table 3
AVERAGE GRANTEE PROFILES
FOR SUBSCRIPTION INCOME AND SUBSCRIBERS BY OPERATING BUDGET SIZE AND LICENSEE TYPE
PUBLIC TELEVISION GRANTEES, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Operating Budget and Licensee Type	Number of Grantees	Average Subscription Income	Subscription as % of Gross Income*	Subscription as % of Cash Income	Average Number of Subscribers	Subscription per Subscriber	Grantees with Subs. Program as % of All Grantees
Operating Budget: $6 Million or More							
Community	22	$6,958,384	26.90%	30.20%	120,953	$57.53	100.00%
University	11	$1,929,238	20.80%	23.90%	36,792	$52.44	100.00%
Local Authority	1	**	**	**	**	**	**
State	10	$1,454,410	9.80%	11.10%	32,086	$45.33	70.00%
Grand Total	44	$4,292,049	22.80%	25.70%	76,967	$55.76	90.90%
Operating Budget: $2.5 Million - $5.9 Million							
Community	35	$1,032,041	24.80%	28.00%	21,153	$48.79	100.00%
University	17	$712,565	16.30%	20.80%	13,843	$51.47	94.10%
Local Authority	5	$346,044	10.20%	11.80%	6,286	$55.05	80.00%
State	10	$543,938	10.70%	12.30%	12,143	$44.79	80.00%
All Licensees	67	$826,935	19.30%	22.50%	16,844	$49.09	94.00%
Operating Budget: Less than $2.5 Million							
Community	35	$332,665	20.10%	22.10%	6,277	$53.00	94.30%
University	33	$153,629	9.30%	12.10%	3,148	$48.81	81.80%
Local Authority	3	$323,883	15.70%	19.90%	19,866	$16.30	100.00%
State	12	$125,926	7.60%	10.20%	2,397	$52.55	58.30%
All Licensees	83	$231,275	13.80%	16.80%	4,963	$46.60	84.30%
Operating Budget Sizes							
Community	92	$2,183,143	26.00%	29.20%	39,359	$55.47	97.80%
University	61	$629,590	16.60%	20.40%	12,195	$51.62	88.50%
Local Authority	9	$300,208	8.40%	9.80%	10,114	$29.68	77.80%
State	32	$671,706	9.80%	11.30%	14,720	$45.63	68.80%
All Licensees	194	$1,357,993	21.00%	24.10%	25,397	$53.47	89.20%

*Gross income refers to income from all sources including cash indiret and in-kind income.
**Data for a category represented by fewer than three grantees are not presented in this table.

Source: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Policy Development and Planning, September 1990

Table 4
AVERAGE GRANTEE PROFILES
FOR SUBSCRIPTION INCOME AND SUBSCRIBERS BY OPERATING BUDGET SIZE AND LICENSEE TYPE
PUBLIC RADIO GRANTEES, FISCAL YEAR 1989

Operating Budget and Licensee Type	Number of Grantees	Average Subscription Income	Subscription as % of Gross Income*	Subscription as % of Cash Income	Average Number of Subscribers	Subscription per Subscriber	Grantees with Subs. Program as % of All Grantees
Operating Budget: $1 Million or More							
Community	31	$539,377	29.50%	32.20%	10,625	$50.76	100.00%
University	49	$379,853	21.70%	29.00%	7,142	$53.19	98.00%
Local Authority	6	$580,034	19.00%	22.90%	13,731	$42.24	83.30%
State	4	$375,832	18.60%	20.00%	12,857	$29.23	75.00%
All Licensees	90	$447,967	23.90%	29.00%	9,035	$49.58	96.70%
Operating Budget: $600,000-$999,999							
Community	25	$229,523	29.20%	34.50%	3,663	$62.66	100.00%
University	71	$97,296	12.10%	16.40%	2,070	$47.01	93.00%
Local Authority	5	$69,562	8.90%	11.90%	1,835	$37.91	80.00%
State	6	$86,474	10.80%	13.80%	3,133	$27.60	50.00%
All Licensees	107	$126,288	15.80%	20.70%	2,491	$50.70	91.60%
Operating Budget: Less than $600,000							
Community	44	$76,613	19.40%	23.10%	1,685	$45.47	90.90%
University	63	$34,102	7.20%	10.20%	1,030	$33.10	74.60%
Local Authority	9	$41,518	9.40%	12.20%	526	$78.88	33.30%
State	3	$26,282	7.10%	9.00%	547	$48.05	33.30%
All Licensees	119	$50,184	11.40%	15.10%	1,222	$41.06	76.50%
All Operating Budget Sizes							
Community	100	$258,297	27.60%	31.00%	4,951	$52.17	96.00%
University	183	$151,198	16.00%	21.70%	3,070	$49.25	88.00%
Local Authority	20	$210,084	16.10%	19.80%	4,815	$43.63	60.00%
State	13	$161,617	15.00%	17.30%	5,528	$29.24	53.80%
All Licensees	316	$189,246	19.50%	24.50%	3,877	$48.82	87.30%

*Gross income refers to income from all sources including cash indiret and in-kind income.
**Data for a category represented by fewer than three grantees are not presented in this table.

Source: Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Policy Development and Planning, September 1990

R 4250-1.7F 9/91

cpb **Research Notes**

No. 39, April 1991

Highlights from the PUBLIC TELEVISION PROGRAMMING SURVEY, 1988

Broadcast days continue to lengthen

The average public television broadcast day continued to increase during the 1987-88 season. The number of hours broadcast reached a daily average of 16 hours and 48 minutes, a nine percent increase from 1985-86 and a 58 percent increase overall since 1973-74. In the course of an average day during the season, public television broadcasters aired about 28 programs, an increase of about 2 programs per day from the previous season.

The average number of broadcast hours and of programs both showed consistent growth over the preceding twelve years.

Program types continue to shift toward older, "general" audiences

Programs aired by public broadcasters are typically divided into three types, defined by their intended audience and use: "general audience" programs (accounting for 72.9 percent of broadcast hours during 1988) and instructional programs (15.5 percent of airtime), with a third category ("dual use") consisting of crossover programs produced by Children's Television Workshop, such as *Sesame Street* and *The Electric Company*, which accounted for 11.7 percent of airtime in 1988.

Although the percentage of all programming devoted to general audience programming decreased slightly since 1986, from 74.5 to 72.9 percent, the overall trend since 1974 was a shift away from children's and instructional programming and an increased number of hours airing such program types as news and public affairs and information and skills programs. The average public television broadcaster aired about 2 hours and 44 minutes of news and public affairs programs and 5 hours and 19 minutes of information and skills programming a day.

News and public affairs programming includes such programs as *MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, *Wall $treet Week*, and *Washington Week in Review* and information and skills programming includes *NOVA* and *This Old House*.

In spite of overall growth in general audience programming, general programs specifically for pre-school children and youth (a category that does not include pre-school children's "dual use" programming such as *Sesame Street*) dropped to a record low of 5.8 percent of airtime. The percentage of cultural programming has also decreased from 20.5 percent of airtime in 1986 to 17.9 percent of airtime in 1988; a level exactly the same as in 1974.

Instructional programming continued to increase its share of broadcast time, increasing from 14.5 percent in 1986 to 15.5 percent in 1988; however, instruction programming decreased considerably from 1974 (17.1 percent).

Less airtime going to programs produced within public television

Public television stations continued to produce a large share of programming (32.3 percent of total airtime in 1988). However, this share, which combines production by "major producing stations", all other public television stations, and local production by the station airing the program, decreased by over 10 share points from 42.8 percent of total airtime in 1986. Despite the overall growth in the broadcast day, the absolute number of broadcast hours devoted to programs produced by public television stations is at a record low. At the same time, consortium or U.S. co-production increased from 3.1 percent in 1986 to 9.1 percent in 1988.

For locally produced programming (i.e., programming which is produced by the station on which it is aired), a similar decline continued, from 11.4 percent in 1974 to 5.2 percent in 1988. Although there is an overall downtrend of the percentage of locally produced programming, the figure was exactly the same from 1986 to 1988, which may indicate a levelling off.

Conversely, airtime devoted both to programs made by independent producers in the U.S. and to those made by foreign producers including international co-production increased, together reaching a high of 49.5 percent of total airtime. U.S. independent producers' share climbed 6.4 points to its highest level (35.5 percent) in 1988. Foreign-produced programs (including international co-productions) more than tripled in their absolute number of broadcast hours on public television since 1974 through 1988 and more than doubled in their share of airtime, from 5.8 percent to 14 percent.

PBS-distributed programs less dominant in schedules

Since its inception, PBS has been the principal distributor of public television programming. In 1988, however, the PBS-distributed programs' share of all airtime was at its lowest level in 14 years, although its 62 percent share, even when compared with the 71.6 percent in 1978, remained unquestionably dominant.

Locally-distributed programming which had been declining from 1974 to 1986, increased from 4.9 percent in 1986 to 6.4 percent in 1988, a rise of 1.5 percentage points in airtime between the last two surveys.

The Interregional Program Service and other regional networks drastically increased their overall airtime, from 9.6 percent in 1974 to 17.8 percent in 1988.

The remaining distributors (a "catchall" combining commercial syndicators, the Agency for Instructional Technology, CPB's minority program consortia, and other instructional and non-instructional program distributors), experienced a 13.8 percent decrease in broadcast hours, decreasing by 3.4 percentage points from 1986.

The table on the following page summarizes the information contained in the Public Television Programming Survey for 1988.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TELEVISION PROGRAMMING, 1974-1988[1]
Historical Trends

System Characteristics	1974	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988
Number of Television Stations	238	253	272	281	291	303	313	322
Number of Broadcasters	151	152	156	160	164	169	182	186
Broadcasters in the Survey[2]	151	152	156	160	164	169	178	169
Broadcast Hours and Number of Program								
Average Annual Hours per Broadcaster	3,872	4,542	4,894	5,128	5,421	5,542	5,650	6,135
Average Annual Number of Programs per Broadcaster	6,547	7,607	8,282	8,823	9,162	8,978	9,327	10,127
PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL BROADCAST HOURS								
A. Program Content								
General	61.6	66.5	70.7	71.3	72	73.2	74.5	72.9
News and Public Affairs[3]	12.6	11.9	11	12.2	12.4	14.1	16.4	16.3
Information and Skills	15.9	19.9	23.6	22.8	24.5	25.5	29.5	31.7
Cultural	17.9	20.9	22.1	21.9	22.8	20.1	20.5	17.9
General Children's & Youth[4]	10.7	10	8.7	8.9	7.5	7.9	6.5	5.8
Other General	4.4	3.8	5.3	5.5	4.8	5.5	1.6	1.2
Sesame Street & Electric Co.	21.2	17.8	16.1	15.5	14.8	14.8	11.4	11.7
Instructional	17.1	16.6	14.9	14.7	14.3	13	14.5	15.5
Electric Co. and Villa Alegre[5]	-	-	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.1	1	0.4
Other Children's & Youth	15.2	13.4	12.1	12.2	11.8	11.4	n/a	n/a
Adult Educational	1.9	1.4	1.2	1	1.4	0.6	n/a	n/a
B. Producer[6]								
Local (Broadcaster's Facilities)	11.4	10.1	7.7	7	6.7	5.7	5.2	5.2
Major PTV Production Center	45.4	21.5	24.2	28.4	25.9	44.4	37.6	27.1
Other PTV Source		26.7	28	17.8	19.7			
Consortium/U.S. Co-production	2.5	1.7	1.8	2.7	2.6	3.3	3.1[7]	9.8
Children's TV Workshop	22	18.8	16.8	17.1	15.8	16.4	29.1	16.1
Independent Producer	5.9	6.1	5.3	7.9	11.3	9.2		19.4
Foreign Producer	5.8	7.6	9.1	7.8	6	8.9	11	8.7
International Coproduction				4.7	4.1	4.3	4.1	5.3
Commercial Producer	1.9	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.9	2.8	5.5	4.4
Non-PTV ITV Producer								4
Other	5.1	4.6	4.4	3.5	4	4.6	4.4	0.1
C. Distributor								
Local Distribution Only	11.3	10	7.4	6.8	6.2	5.6	4.9	6.4
Public Broadcasting Service	62.1	69.3	71.6	69.6	67.1	65.3	63.9	62
Regional PTV Network	9.6	6.2	5.4	7.6	10.8	13	14	17.8
Other	17	14.5	15.6	16	15.9	16.1	17.2	13.8

1 1974 and 1976 are calendar years. 1978 to 1988 are fiscal years. 1988 survey used different methodology.
2 In 1988 only broadcasters in the 50 states and the District of Columbia were surveyed.
3 In 1986 and 1988 this category includes "Business or Consumer".
4 Excluding *Sesame Street* and *The Electric Company;* including *Mister Rogers Neighborhood*.
5 After 1974 *Villa Alegre* programs were double counted if aired during school hours when school in session.
6 1984, 1986, and 1988 definitions and categories differ from those used in prior reports.
7 In 1986 "U.S. Co-production" replaced "Consortium".

R4250-1.8F 9/91

cpb **Research Notes**

No. 40, May 1991

Hispanic Listening to Public Radio

by Richard H. Madden[1]

Question #1: How many Hispanics listen to public radio?
Answer #1: Probably not very many.

Question #2: Which stations do Hispanics listen to most?
Answer #2: Those owned and operated by Hispanics.

Question #3: What do other public stations offer Hispanics?
Answer #3: Not much.

These answers are probably the ones most often given by those inside and outside of public broadcasting.

The answers are wrong!

From a national perspective, public radio serves Hispanics in measurable, indeed sizeable proportions. The issue is not just whether Hispanics listen but to which stations they listen and why. This examination of public radio's Hispanic audience concludes that geographic location is the principal factor that determines Hispanic listening.

Arbitron assesses Hispanic listening in markets with the largest Hispanic populations. About 74% of U.S. Hispanics age 12+ live in these markets. A CPB-supported station is available to about 95% of these Hispanics. They have access to 45 CPB-supported stations. Hispanic listeners to these 45 stations in these 22 Arbitron controlled metro markets in 1988 and 1989 are the focus of this study.

And Hispanics listen!

[1]Richard H. Madden is the Director of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting Radio Program Fund.

HOW MANY HISPANICS LISTEN TO PUBLIC RADIO?

Per the table to the right, over nine percent of public radio's cume audience in these 22 markets in the two year study period were Hispanic. While sizeable, it falls short of Hispanic population composition in these markets, which averaged 16.8%.

Hispanic Composition of Public Radio Audience

	Population (000)	Cume Audience (000)
Total 12+	54,227	3,588
Hispanics 12+	9,125	338
Composition	16.8%	9.4%

WHAT STATIONS DO HISPANICS LISTEN TO?

45 CPB-supported stations served listeners in markets controlled by Arbitron for Hispanic listening during both years of the study. Not surprisingly, Hispanic use of these stations varies. Fifteen of these 45 stations (33%) accounted for 72% of Hispanic listening to public radio in 1988 and 1989.

Stations With Largest Hispanic Cumes

Station	Market	Hispanic Cume	Percent Total US Hispanic Audience	Percent Composition Station Cume
WBGO-FM	NEW YORK	28,100	8.3	11.9
KSJV-FM	FRESNO	24,000	7.1	93.6
WNYC-FM	NEW YORK	22,850	6.8	6.2
KUSC-FM	LOS ANGELES	21,800	6.5	7.6
KPCC-FM	LOS ANGELES	18,300	5.4	17.6
KPFK-FM	LOS ANGELES	17,850	5.3	14.2
KLON-FM	LOS ANGELES	15,200	4.5	12.3
KUHF-FM	HOUSTON-GALVESTON	14,850	4.4	10.3
KPFA-FM	SAN FRANCISCO	14,200	4.2	14.7
KCRW-FM	LOS ANGELES	13,800	4.1	6.1
KPBS-FM	SAN DIEGO	11,850	3.5	14.3
WBAI-FM	NEW YORK	11,100	3.3	8.4
KQED-FM	SAN FRANCISCO	10,650	3.2	4.7
KXCR-FM	EL PASO	9,650	2.9	55.0
KPFT-FM	HOUSTON-GALVESTON	9,600	2.8	28.2
Remaining 30 Stations		94,100	27.8	6.9
TOTAL		337,901	100	9.4

Per the above table, WBGO-FM had a weekly Hispanic cume of 28,100. Its Hispanic cume audience was 8.3% of public radio's national cume audience with Hispanics constituting 11.9% of the station's overall audience.

HOW LONG DO HISPANICS LISTEN?

Major market stations typically have lower time spent listening (TSL) because of the availability of so many stations competing for

listeners' time. Stations in markets controlled for Hispanic listening are also located in major markets. So the public radio TSL is lower than the nationwide average per the following table.

The table also shows that Hispanic TSL to public radio is virtually the same as other listeners' TSL. This may initially appear contrary to other studies of Hispanic listening to all radio. These other studies suggest that Hispanics listen to radio longer than non-Hispanics. What the finding of this study more likely suggests is that the Hispanic public radio audience listens to public radio for about the same amount of time per week as non-Hispanic listeners. This is probably caused by public radio's program appeal.

Hispanic
Time Spent Listening

	1988/1989 Time Spent Listening
All Public Radio Listeners Nationwide:	7.5 hours
Public Stations Controlled for Hispanic Listening --	
Hispanic Listeners:	6.6 hours
Other Listeners:	6.8 hours

WHY DO HISPANICS LISTEN TO THESE STATIONS?

Licensee control, language, appeal, budget, and geographic location are among the suggested answers.

LICENSEE CONTROL:

The table to the right is a list of Hispanic owned and controlled stations and their Hispanic audiences. To read: KSJV-FM, Fresno has an Hispanic cume of 24,000. Fresno's Hispanic population represents 7.1% of the total U.S. Hispanic audience. The Hispanic population in Fresno represents 1.7% of the total U.S. Hispanic population.

Hispanic Listening to
Hispanic Controlled Stations

Station	Market	Hispanic Cume	Percent Total US Hispanic Audience	Percent Total US Hispanic Population
KSJV-FM	FRESNO	24,000	7.1	1.7
KXCR-FM	EL PASO	9,650	2.9	3.2
KBBF-FM	SAN FRANCISCO	6,950	2.1	6.9
KDNA-FM	YAKIMA WA	5,000	1.5	0.2
TOTAL		45,600	13.5	12.0

This study does not include three other Hispanic owned and controlled CPB-supported stations.

Arbitron added Denver (KUVO FM) to the list of markets controlled by Arbitron for Hispanic listening in 1990 after the 1988-1989 period covered by the study.

- Arbitron does not survey in Puerto Rico. So Hato Rey (WIPR FM) is not included.

- Salinas (KHDC FM) had no Radio Research Consortium subscriber during the study years.

In summary, the four Hispanic controlled stations included in this study explain about 14% of U.S. Hispanic public radio listening. KSJV FM's audience accounted for half that amount. The markets served by these stations include 12% of the U.S. Hispanic population age 12+. Since 85% of Hispanic listening is to non-Hispanic controlled stations, it appears that Hispanic control is not a dominant factor in determining existing Hispanic listening.

This should not be surprising since it is unlikely that any radio listener would choose a station based on its ownership or that the licensee's race or ethnicity would compel targeting to a like audience. Licensees determine which audiences they wish to serve and listeners determine whether stations are successful in providing appealing programming.

LANGUAGE

A predominantly Spanish language station, KSJV-FM, Fresno, is among the stations with larger Hispanic audiences.

And other stations (KPBS-FM, San Diego; KPFK-FM, Los Angeles; KPFT-FM and KUHF-FM, Houston-Galveston; WBAI-FM, New York) include some Spanish language programming in their overall formats. They show significant Hispanic audiences as well.

In fact, most of the 45 stations showing Hispanic listening have English-only or predominantly English-only formats.

Spanish language stations meet a need. Indeed, Hispanics make up the largest proportion of audiences for such stations. Still, public radio Spanish language programming does not currently appear to be a dominant factor in generating public radio Hispanic listeners nationally.

APPEAL

The appeals of the 15 stations with larger Hispanic listenership listed above are as diverse as the public radio system. The table on the next page lists how each of these stations described their formats during the period of the study:

Formats of Stations with Larger Hispanic Audiences

Station	Market	Format
WBGO-FM	NEW YORK	Jazz/News & Information
KSJV-FM	FRESNO	Bilingual (Spanish/English) Folk
WNYC-FM	NEW YORK	Classical and Contemporary Concert Music
KUSC-FM	LOS ANGELES	Classical Music
KPCC-FM	LOS ANGELES	Big Band/News and Information
KPFK-FM	LOS ANGELES	Eclectic
KLON-FM	LOS ANGELES	Jazz News-Information
KUHF-FM	HOUSTON-GALVESTON	Classical/News
KPFA-FM	SAN FRANCISCO	Eclectic
KCRW-FM	LOS ANGELES	Eclectic
KPBS-FM	SAN DIEGO	Fine Arts and News
WBAI-FM	NEW YORK	News and Information/Music/Drama
KQED-FM	SAN FRANCISCO	News and Information
KXCR-FM	EL PASO	Contemporary Jazz/Rhythm and Blues/Bilingual News and Public Affairs
KPFT-FM	HOUSTON-GALVESTON	Eclectic

Using their own definitions, each station appeals to a somewhat different, perhaps overlapping audience.

The majority of the audience of three Spanish language stations (KBBF-FM, KDNA-FM, and KSJV-FM) is Hispanic. Except for KSJV-FM, the overall Hispanic audience is relatively low.

The majority of the audience for two other stations is also Hispanic. One is KXCR-FM, El Paso, that describes its format as Contemporary Jazz/Rhythm and Blues/Bilingual News and Public Affairs. As noted, it has one of the larger Hispanic cumes. The other is KETR-FM, Dallas-Ft. Worth that describes its format during the study as Contemporary/News/Bluegrass/Classical.

Spanish language programming should and does appeal to an Hispanic audience. Still, program formats grounded in a variety of other appeals also deliver large, Hispanic audiences. So, no single appeal delivers Hispanic listeners.

BUDGET

Per the table on the following page, the 45 study stations enjoyed average annual incomes (NFFS, CSGs and NPPAGs) that were 36% greater than the typical CPB-supported station. This is likely due to the location of stations in the nation's largest markets.

Among the 15 stations with larger Hispanic audiences are stations with budgets that were below the average budget for the 45 stations. And some of the 45 stations with budgets above the average had very small Hispanic audiences. Indeed, a statistical

analysis of station budgets and Hispanic cume audiences confirms there is no correlation between budget and Hispanic audience.

Stations by Income

1988/1989	Average Income
System wide	$879,000
45 Stations in Study	$1,193,000
15 Stations w/Larger Hisp. Cumes	$1,797,000
30 Stations w/Smaller Hisp. Cumes	$889,000

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

The 45 CPB-supported stations that are the focus of this study are located in the 22 metro markets that Arbitron controls for Hispanic listening. CPB-supported stations were in place in both 1988 and 1989.

The table to the right compares the per market Hispanic cume audience 12+ with the per market Hispanic population 12+. To read, 2.3 million Hispanics or 25% of the Hispanic population age 12+ lived in the Los Angeles metro area during 1988 and 1989. Of this population, 88,050 Hispanics or 26% of public radio's national Hispanic cume audience also lived in Los Angeles.

Per Market Comparison of Hispanic Audience and Population

Market	Hispanic Cume Audience	Percent Total US Hispanic Audience	Hispanic Population 12+	Percent Total US Hispanic Population
LOS ANGELES	88,050	26.1	2,311,300	25.3
NEW YORK	77,000	22.8	1,791,250	19.6
MIAMI-FT. LAUDERDALE-HOLLYWOOD	6,050	1.8	716,850	7.9
SAN FRANCISCO	36,500	10.8	629,150	6.9
CHICAGO	7,000	2.1	525,600	5.8
SAN ANTONIO	6,000	1.8	493,500	5.4
HOUSTON-GALVESTON	24,450	7.2	484,450	5.3
SAN DIEGO	11,850	3.5	298,450	3.3
EL PASO	17,300	5.1	292,250	3.2
DALLAS-FT. WORTH	8,500	2.5	278,350	3.1
PHOENIX	4,150	1.2	209,150	2.3
RIVERSIDE-SAN BERNARDINO	2,750	.8	186,850	2.0
ALBUQUERQUE	2,900	.9	164,050	1.8
FRESNO	25,000	7.4	150,800	1.7
AUSTIN	6,150	1.8	117,750	1.3
SACRAMENTO	4,651	1.4	113,700	1.2
TUCSON	3,400	1.0	109,750	1.2
BAKERSFIELD	0	.0	89,600	1.0
STOCKTON	550	.2	74,650	.8
MODESTO	300	.1	40,950	.4
SANTA BARBARA	350	.1	27,200	.3
YAKIMA WA	5,000	1.5	19,400	.2
TOTAL	337,901	100.0	9,125,000	100.0

A strong correlation exists between the Hispanic cumulative audience and the Hispanic population. Hispanic population is a factor in determining the number of Hispanics listening to public radio.

No other factor appears to predict Hispanic audience. So, station geographic location appears to be the dominant factor in determining Hispanic listenership to public radio.

CONCLUSIONS

What does this information tell stations, producers, distributors, and funders as they set about to achieve the system goal of serving Hispanics?

The distinct message is that to serve more Hispanics, public stations that include Hispanics in their target audience must be located in markets where the most Hispanics live.

The three top U.S. Hispanic population centers (Los Angeles, New York, and Miami), account for over 50% of the U.S. Hispanics 12+. In these three cities, Hispanics are 18.8% of the population but only 8.6% of public radio's Hispanic audience. Accordingly, directed efforts in these cities are apt to be more effective than other strategies at measurably increasing the Hispanic audience.

Stations in these three cities, and other stations with larger concentrations of Hispanics in their audiences, should be aware of the opportunity and challenge of serving this audience. Their first question should be whether their existing, sizeable Hispanic audience is a result of happenstance or of a directed effort. Directed programming, promotion, development, marketing, and personnel strategies that reflect the diversity of listenership are in order for these stations.

These communities could also establish new stations with a primary mission of serving an Hispanic audience. Or existing stations could rework their formats. Regardless of the format or language of that format, these alternatives are not likely in the foreseeable future. This is because of the lack of available frequencies and the absence of local financial commitment to establish such stations. Related issues are the increasing commercial competition for Hispanic listeners and station economic viability.

A national solution is equally problematic per the following.

Hispanic listeners reflect different cultural subgroups, with different cities having different Hispanic majorities, for example, Cuban, Puerto Rican and Mexican. Because of immigration patterns over the past decade, even these are rapidly changing. For instance in New York, the Dominican, Salvadoran and Central and South American communities are growing. Since no monolithic national Hispanic population exists, no single local or national program schedule, commercial or noncommercial, is likely to appeal to all Hispanics.

Indeed, Broadcasting magazine's December 10, 1990 report on Hispanic broadcasting noted that Spanish commercial radio now includes at least 10 distinct formats. The evidence suggested by this study of Hispanic listening to public radio appears to yield similar results. Hispanic listening to classics, jazz, news and information, eclectic, and Hispanic formatted stations varies market-to-market. So, no single national format is likely to appeal to Hispanics.

Hispanic listeners, like all listeners, listen to formats not individual programs. Accordingly, no single national program is likely to appeal to the stations with larger Hispanic audiences. And, the aggregate funding is not available now to meet the costs for creating such a single highly targeted, discrete national program service.

For these reasons, the creation of an economically viable national program service targeted solely, or even primarily, to Hispanics is also not likely at this time.

Finally, most public radio Hispanic listeners are listening to monolingual-English programming. Any strategy, no matter how successful, for increasing the Hispanic audience that focuses on existing stations and their audiences will, almost by definition, not serve the monolingual-Spanish speaking audience. The resulting policy question is whether service to bilingual or monolingual-English speaking Hispanics represents sufficient performance on the system's responsibility to serve the Hispanic audience.

It is an important question since, from a national perspective, public radio has proven that it is able to serve many Hispanics in measurable, indeed sizeable proportions.